

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

VOLUME LIV

1939

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1939

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME LIV

	PAGE
Sehrt, E H, The Comparative and Superlative Suffixes <i>-er- -est-</i> and <i>-ôr- -ôst-</i> in Notker's Works	1
Walz, J A, <i>Die Sonne geht zu Gnaden</i>	8
Strout, A L, An Unpublished Ballad-Translation by Scott, <i>The Battle of Kallhecrankie</i>	13
Shaw, E P, New Facts Relating to the Biography of Jacques Cazotte	19
Cioranescu, Al, La premiere Rédaction de l' <i>Ollivier</i> de Cazotte	28
Roberts, J G, Béranger's Neglected Poem to Manuel	32
Ilmer, F, Some Remarks Regarding a Textual Change in Goethe's "Heidenroslein"	35
Herben, S J, <i>The Ruin</i>	37
Stoll, Elmer Edgar, Jaques and the Antiquaries	79
Allen, N B, <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> Further Restored	85
Dunlap, A R, What Purgative Drug?	92
Baudin, Maurice, The King's Minister in Seventeenth-Century French Drama	94
Vincent, C J, Pettie and Greene	105
Allen, Don Cameron, Melbancke and Gosson	111
Cornu, Donald, Swift, Motte and the Copyright Struggle Two Unnoticed Documents	114
Wester, Dixon, Horace Walpole and Edmund Burke	124
Holmes, Elizabeth K, Some Sources of Wordsworth's Passages on Mythology	127
Warfel, Harry R, Poe's Dr Percival A Note on <i>The Fall of the House of Usher</i>	129
Brown, Carleton, <i>See Myche, Say Lytell, and Lerne to Soffer in Tyme</i>	131
Kenyon, John S, <i>Wife of Bath's Tale</i> 1159 62	133
Dempster, Germaine, A Further Note on Dorigen's <i>Exempla</i>	137
Honti, John Th, Vinland and Ultima Thule	159
Turgeon, F K, Unpublished Letters of Jean-Baptiste Racine to the Abbé Renaudot	172
Fucilla, J G, Unedited Voltaire Letters to Count di Polcenigo	184
Bonno, G, Deux Lettres inédites de Fontenelle à Newton	188
Schweitzer, J W, Dryden's Use of Scudéry's <i>Almahide</i>	190
Pitou, Spire, Jr, A Portuguese Adaptation of La Calprenède's <i>Faramond</i>	192
Gilman, Margaret, <i>Les Limbes</i>	195
Zucker, A E, The Courtiers in <i>Hamlet</i> and <i>The Wild Duck</i>	196
Forchheimer, Paul, Zu Morgensterns <i>Stemochs</i>	198
Tupper, F S, New Facts Regarding Owen Feltham	199
Gilbert, A H, Chapman's Fortune with Winged Hands Supplementary	201

	PAGE
Stearns, M W, Robert Henryson and the Fulgentian Horse	239
Bressie, Ramona, MS Sloane 3548, Folio 158	246
Chapman, C O, Numerical Symbolism in Dante and the <i>Pearl</i>	256
Konick, Marcus, <i>Exeter Book Riddle 41</i> as a Continuation of <i>Riddle 40</i>	259
Vignerat, L-A, Notes sur Jean Renart	262
Wolff, Hans M, <i>Der zerbrochene Krug und König Oidipus</i>	267
Drapei, J W, Jacques' "Seven Ages" and Bartholomaeus Anglicus	273
Shaaber, M A, A Textual Dilemma in <i>1 Henry IV</i>	276
Bowman, W P, Some Plays by George Soane	278
Bush, Douglas, William Painter and Thomas Heywood	279
Bowers, F T, An Interpretation of Donne's <i>Tenth Elegy</i>	280
Cummings, E C, An Obscure Line in Brant's <i>Narrenschiff</i>	283
Sehrt, E H, A Note on Line 1514 of the <i>Heland</i>	284
Steiner, Arpad, An Italo-German <i>Faustsplitter</i> of 1621	286
Remak, H H, Heyse, Schott and Fontaine	287
Salinger, Herman, Housman's <i>Last Poems</i> , XXX and Heine's <i>Lyrisches Intermezzo</i> 62	288
Livingston, C H, Tobler-Lommatzsch <i>Chief (Chaver)</i>	290
Griffith, R H, <i>Phenagling</i>	291
Morphopoulos, Panos, Byron's Translation and Use of Modern Greek Writings	317
Brown, Ford K, Notes on 41 Skinner Street	326
Stoll, Elmer Edgar, Shakespeare Forbears	332
Cameron, Sister Mary David, Sources of Tahureau's Lyrics	339
Chester, Allan G, The Date and Authorship of <i>The Fraternite of Vacabondes</i>	347
Halstead, W L, Note on Dekker's <i>Old Fortunatus</i>	351
Stallman, Donald G, Milton as Proof Reader	353
Fogle, S F, Notes on Ambrose Philips	354
Wright, Austin, The Beginning of Pope's Friendship with Spence	359
Wasserman, Earl R, A Doubtful Poem in the Collins Canon	361
Moore, J R, Defoe's Use of Personal Experience in <i>Colonel Jack</i>	362
Roellinger, F X, A Note on Kettner's <i>Book of the Table</i>	363
Holbrook, Wm C, A MS Copy of Writings by Voltaire	365
Ham, Edward B, Fragments from the <i>Faits des Romains</i>	366
Körner, Josef, Marginalien zu Heine II	399
Koenig, V F, <i>A or batu</i> a Problem in Lexicology	413
O'Brien, Justin, Henry Harland, an American Forerunner of Proust	420
Johat, Eugène, Smollett, Editor of Voltaire	429
Lancaster, H C, Castillo Solórzano's <i>El celoso hasta la muerte</i> and Montfleury's <i>Ecole des Jaloux</i>	430
Mathews, Ernst G, Montfleury's <i>Ecole des Jaloux</i> and Aphra Behn's <i>The False Count</i>	438
Wright, L O and Robe, S L, Final Consonant Plus N-Glide in Jalisco, Mexico	439
Colledge, Eric, "The Hours of the Planets", an Obscure Passage in <i>The Recluse</i>	442

CONTENTS

v

	PAGE
Sturtevant, A M, The Doublets Old Icelandic <i>Skyti Skytja</i> , 'Shooter, Marksman'	445
Sanderlin, George, Quotations from St Bernard in <i>The Parson's Tale</i>	447
Scott-Thomas, H F, A Chaucerian (?) Fisherman	448
Hammett, E A, A Note for the <i>NED</i>	449
Banks, T H, The Meaning of "Gods" in <i>Paradise Lost</i>	450
Vincent, H P, Three Unpublished Letters of Abraham Cowley	454
Wilson, J H, Two Poems Ascribed to Rochester	458
Wasserman, E R, The Walpole-Chatterton Controversy	460
Sanderlin, George, The Repute of Shakespeare's Sonnets in the Early Nineteenth Century	462
Pitt, A S, Franklin and William Penn's <i>No Cross, No Crown</i>	466
Boys, Richard, David Malloch and <i>The Edinburgh Miscellany</i>	468
Bressie, Ramona, "A Governour Wily and Wys"	477
Murphree, A A, and Strauch, C F, The Chronology of <i>The Return of the Native</i>	491
Anderson, M L, Hardy's Debt to Webster in <i>The Return of the Native</i>	497
Kunstmann, J G, <i>Hildebrandslied</i> 20-22a	501
Livingston, C H, Old French <i>Belluré</i>	506
Quynn, D M, The Identity of 'M T Coyfurelly'	510
Kennedy, R L, <i>La Gala del nadar</i> —Date and Authorship	514
Privitera, J F, Molière in Franche-Comté	517
Lancaster, H C, Saint-Réal's <i>Don Carlos</i> and <i>Phèdre</i> , 1093-6	519
Remak, H H, A Bibliographical Note on Voltaire	520
Seeber, E D, Faiguët, réformateur de l'orthographe	523
Malone, Kemp, Some Linguistic Studies of 1937 and 1938	525
Frey, J R, Bibliographie zur Theorie und Technik des deutschen Romans (1910-1938)	557
Kltzke, Carl, Hans Winter's <i>Bericht von der Kunst des Meistergesangs</i>	567
Kahn, L W, <i>Der Stachel der Liebe</i>	572
Wells, M E, The Age of Isaac at the Time of the Sacrifice	579
Livingston, C. H, Old French <i>la (laa)</i> , Modern French <i>layette</i>	582
Halstead, W L, Note on the Text of <i>The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt</i>	585
Coon, A M, Izaak Walton, <i>Prochein Amy</i>	589
Chew, S P, Jr, Prévost's <i>Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la vertu</i>	592
Meyerson, Harold, Note on the Etymology of Names in Voltaire's <i>Zadig</i>	597
McKillop, A D, The Authorship of "A Poem to the Memory of Mr Congreve"	599

REVIEWS

	PAGE
E H Zeydel, P Matenko, and R H Fife (eds), Letters of Ludwig Tieck [H J Weigand]	39
C von Klenze, Charles Timothy Brooks [O. W Long]	42
E Castle, Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte, T C van Stockum und J van Dam, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, J Prestel, Deutsche Literaturkunde, W Vogelpohl, Von deutscher Dichtung [E. Feise]	45
A Bach, Geschichte der deutschen Sprache [G Nordmeyer]	48
L W Kahn, Social Ideals in German Literature 1770-1830 [E Feise]	49
E und K Zwirner, Grundfragen der Phonometrie [S Einarsson]	50
D S Blondheim, Les gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi, T II, Etudes lexicographiques [L Brandin]	51
R Levy, Répertoire des Lexiques du Vieux Français [A Eucrit]	53
E D Seiber, Anti-Slavery Opinion in France during the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century [Ira Wade.]	55
Grace Frank and Dorothy Miner (eds), Proverbes en rimes [Louis Cons]	56
Harold Williams (ed), The Poems of Jonathan Swift, M B Gold, Swift's Marriage to Stella [R Quintana]	59
S C Chew, The Crescent and the Rose. [W G Rice]	62
R. Martin, Chronologie de la vie et de l'œuvre de Thomas Gray; Essai sur Thomas Gray, W P Jones, Thomas Gray, Scholar, E G Ainsworth, Poor Collins [Odell Shepard]	64
R G Grylls, Mary Shelley [F. L. Jones.]	66
M O Percival, William Blake's Circle of Destiny. [Denis Saurat]	68
Geoffrey Tillotson, On the Poetry of Pope [George Sherburn]	69
N. I White, The Unextinguished Hearth, Shelley and his Contemporary Critics [D L Clark]	71
Hyder E Rollins (ed), A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare The Poems [E. A. Law]	138
Joseph Mersand, Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary, L. F Hawkins, The Place of Group F in the Canterbury Chronology; Sister M E Whitmore, Medieval English Domestic Life and Amusements in the Works of Chaucer. [M B Rund]	140
R. W Chambers, Thomas More. [W G. Zeeveld.]	142
Sister Imogene Baker, The King's Household in the Arthurian Court [A O Baugh]	145
W G Crane, Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance; Louise B. Osborn, The Life, Letters, and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638 [H. H. Hudson]	147
J Malkiel, Das substantivierte Adjektiv im Französischen [Leo Spitzer.]	148
Kresz, Bruno, Die Laute des modernen Isländischen. [Stefán Einarsson.]	150
Fred Edgumbe (ed), Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats 1820-24; D. H Bodurtha and W B Pope (eds.), C A Brown, Life	

CONTENTS

vii

	PAGE
of John Keats, M B Forman (ed), Some Letters & Miscellanea of Charles Brown [C L Finney]	153
A C Taylor, Carlyle et la pensee latine [Hill Shine]	154
Sir Charles Firth, Essays Historical and Literary [Basil Willey] .	156
M O Johnson, Walt Whitman as a Critic of Literature, H R Zink, Emerson's Use of the Bible, E G Fletcher, The Beginnings of the Professional Theatre in Texas, W R North, Chinese Themes in American Verse; G L White, Jr, Scandinavian Themes in American Fiction, W P Dallmann, The Spirit of America as Interpreted in the Works of Charles Sealsfield, K H Sunder- mann, Herman Melvilles Gedankengut [C Gohdes]	202
T M Parrott and H Craig (eds), The Tragedy of Hamlet a Critical Edition of the Second Quarto, 1604 [T Pyles]	205
Lily B Campbell (ed), The Mirror for Magistrates [H E Rollins]	207
Alfred Harbage, Cavalier Drama [F Henderson]	209
E P Stein, David Garrick, Dramatist [D MacMillan]	210
I A Richards, The Philosophy of Rhetoric [C P Lyons]	213
A J Goedheer, Irish and Norse Traditions about the Battle of Clon- tarf [S Einarsson]	215
J R R Tolkien, Beowulf The Monsters and the Critics [H R Patch]	217
H Rheinfelder, Altfranzösische Grammatik, W von Wartburg, Evo- lution et structure de la langue française, G Gougenheim, Elements de phonologie française [C. A. Knudson]	218
R T Hill (ed), Two Old French Poems on Saint Thibaut, R C Bates (ed), L'Hystoire Job, A J Denomy (ed), The Old French Lives of Saint Agnes and other vernacular versions of the Middle Ages [C A Knudson]	221
E Glasser, Denkform und Gemeinschaft bei Jules Romains [L Spitzer]	223
K Wais, Mallarmé, D A K Aish, La métaphore dans l'œuvre de S Mallarmé [J Scherer]	225
G G Lagrone, The Imitations of "Don Quixote" in the Spanish Drama [E J Crooks]	228
Greenlaw, Osgood, Padelford, Heffner, etc (eds), The Works of Edmund Spenser, Books Six and Seven [H O. Grierson]	293
B J Whiting, Proverbs in the Earlier English Drama [M P Tilley]	295
Maria S De Vito, L'Origine del Drama liturgico [Karl Young]	299
E Carcassonne (ed), Voltaire, Le Temple du Goût, Jean Thomas, L'Humanisme de Diderot [Albert Schinz.]	301
Pedro Salinas, Lost Angel and Other Poems Translations of Eleanor L Turnbull [Carlos Castillo]	303
G Minde-Pouet (ed), Heinrich von Kleists Werke, III-VII [J O. Blankenagel]	304
O R von Xylander, Heinrich von Kleist und J J Rousseau [J O Blankenagel]	306
E Reich (ed), Grillparzer's dramatisches Werk [F W Kaufmann]	307

	PAGE
M L Mare and W H Quarrell (trans and eds), <i>Lichtenberg's Visits to England, as Described in his Letters and Diaries</i> [G W Stone, Jr]	308
Charlotte D'Evelyn (ed), <i>Peter Idley's Instructions to his Son</i> [H L Savage]	310
A M Turner, <i>The Making of "The Cloister and the Hearth"</i> [W Y Tindall]	312
Paul Hankamer, <i>Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock</i> [W R Gaede]	367
Folke Leander, <i>Humanism and Naturalism</i> [A O Lovejoy.]	372
M Romera-Navarro (ed), <i>El Criticon</i> , por Baltasar Gracián [S G Morley]	374
E B Williams, <i>From Latin to Portuguese</i> [Leo Spitzer]	376
Pierre Jourda, <i>L'Exotisme dans la littérature française depuis Chateaubriand</i> [G Chinard]	378
E Von der Mühl, <i>Denis Veiras et son Histoire des Séarambes (1677-1679)</i> [Ira Wade]	380
N L Torrey, <i>The Spirit of Voltaire</i> [Ira Wade]	383
Ira O Wade, <i>The Clandestine Organization and Diffusion of Philosophic Ideas in France from 1700 to 1750</i> [Emile Malakis]	385
Sister Rose Anthony, <i>The Jeremy Collier Stage Controversy, 1698-1726</i> [E N Hooker]	386
B Weinberg, <i>French Realism</i> , J O'Brien, <i>The Novel of Adolescence in France</i> , G Lemaitre, <i>Four French Novelists</i> [J F. Mason]	389
L C Hartley, <i>William Cowper, Humanitarian</i> [N C Hannay]	391
L A Brewer, <i>My Leigh Hunt Library</i> [G D Stout.]	393
A H Gilbert, <i>Machiavelli's Prince and its Forerunners.</i> [N. Oisint]	409
L M Price (ed), <i>Inkle and Yarico</i> [G Chinard]	470
M. E Marcett, <i>Uhtred de Boldon, Friar William Jordan, and Piers Plowman</i> [C O. Chapman]	472
E A Baker, <i>The History of the English Novel, IX</i> [J. W Beach.]	474
R K Root, <i>The Poetical Career of Alexander Pope</i> [George Sherburn]	541
F O Nolte, <i>Grillparzer, Lessing, and Goethe</i> [D. Lasher-Schlitt]	543
F A Voigt and W A Reichart, <i>Hauptmann und Shakespeare, H Barnstorff, Die soziale, politische und wirtschaftliche Zeitkritik im Werke Gerhart Hauptmanns</i> [H Steinhauer]	545
W von Wartburg, <i>Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker</i> [Leo Spitzer.]	547
G Bertoni, <i>Lingua e cultura</i> [Leo Spitzer]	548
F Varnum, <i>Un Philosophe cosmopolite du XVIII^e Siècle, le Chevalier de Chastellux</i> [G Chinard]	550
F. C Riedel, <i>Crime and Punishment in Old French Romances.</i> [S. Panter]	551
M E. Maxfield, <i>Studies in Modern Romansh Poetry in the Engadine.</i> [H H. Vaughan]	552
L Sorieri, <i>Boccaccio's Story of Tito e Gisippo in European Literature</i> [D P Rotunda]	553

CONTENTS

IX

	PAGE
M M Knappen, Tudor Puritanism [<i>Hardin Crag</i>]	600
R R Cawley, the Voyagers and Elizabethan Drama [<i>Una Ellis-Fermor</i>]	603
S A Tannenbaum, Beaumont & Fletcher, Philip Massinger, George Chapman (Concise bibliographies) [<i>Baldwin Maxwell</i>]	605
A H Nethercot, Sir William D'avenant [<i>H Spencer</i>]	606
R C Bald (ed.), <i>Hengist, King of Kent</i> , by Thomas Middleton [<i>H Spencer</i>]	607
Jeanette Marks, The Family of the Barrett [<i>K L Knickerbocker</i>]	609
Wolfgang Mann, Lateinische Dichtung in England [<i>D C Allen</i>]	610
Edwin Casady, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey [<i>A H Gilbert</i>]	611
H J C Grierson, Sir Walter Scott, Bart [<i>H A Eaton</i>]	612
R P T Coffin, New Poetry of New England, Frost and Robinson [<i>G F Whicher</i>]	614
Vittore Branca, Linee di una storia della critica al "Decameron" [<i>C S Singleton</i>]	615
Raymond Naves, Voltaire et l' <i>Encyclopedie</i> [<i>G R Havens</i>]	617
C T Carr, Nominal Compounds in Germanic [<i>E H Sehart</i>]	618
H F H Lenz, Franz Grillparzer's Political Ideas [<i>D Lasher-Schlutt</i>]	622
H R Liedke, Literary Criticism and Romantic Theory in the Work of Achim von Arnim [<i>E Feise</i>]	623

BRIEF MENTION

W Mitzka und B Martin, Deutscher Sprachatlas [<i>E H Sehart</i>]	72
H Shme, Carlyle's Fusion of Poetry, History, and Religion by 1834 [<i>W H Dunn</i>]	73
E Starkie, Arthur Rimbaud in Abyssinia [<i>A. Schinz</i>]	74
E Cottier, Le Comédien auvergnat Montdory [<i>H C Lancaster</i>]	74
M Y Hughes (ed.), John Milton <i>Paradise Lost</i> , etc [<i>W H Parker</i>]	75
E Harlan, Elijah Fenton 1683-1730 [<i>R A Aubin</i>]	75
W T Morgan, A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715) [<i>L I Bredvold</i>]	76
Sister M E Spanheimer, H A Rattermann [<i>A E Zucker</i>]	76
F H Mautner (ed.), Johann Nestroy Ausgewahlte Werke [<i>E Feise</i>]	77
F L Lucas (ed.), The Complete Works of John Webster [<i>L Teeter</i>]	77
Marconi, Bertoni, Falqui e Prati, Dizionario di Marina medievale e moderno [<i>L Spitzer</i>]	157
E B, E L, and H H Setzler, The Jefferson Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Reader [<i>W F Bryan</i>]	157
<i>Helicon</i> [<i>H. C Lancaster</i>]	158
H Daum, P Jurieu und seine Auseinandersetzung mit A Arnauld [<i>A Schinz</i>]	229
F Holdsworth, J de Maistre et l'Angleterre [<i>A Schinz</i>]	230
F W Hilles and P B Daghljan (eds), <i>Anecdotes of Painting in England</i> , collected by Horace Walpole [<i>O H C Baker</i>]	231

	PAGE
D MacMillan (ed), <i>Drury Lane Calendar, 1747-1776</i> [H Spencer]	232
O S Anderson, <i>The Seafarer</i> , An Interpretation [K Malone]	232
B Coles, Shakespeare Studies <i>Hamlet</i> [G C Taylor]	233
<i>Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1938</i> [E Feise]	234
A Dorrer, Das Schemenlaufen in Tirol [W Neuse]	234
J D Wilson, What Happens in <i>Hamlet</i> [H Spencer]	235
Parrott, Hubler, and Telfer (eds), Shakespeare [G C Taylor]	313
R Withington, Excursions in English Drama [G C Taylor]	314
D. J McGinn, Shakespeare's Influence on the Drama of his Age Studied in <i>Hamlet</i> [F T Bowers]	314
L C John, The Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences [H E Rollins]	315
H Hartman (ed), <i>A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure</i> [C J Vincent]	316
L. Cazamian (trans), R Browning, <i>Hommes et Femmes</i> [W C De Vane]	394
J Meier and E Seemann (eds), <i>Lesebuch des deutschen Volksliedes.</i> [W. Neuse]	394
J Crofts, Shakespeare and the Post Horses [G C Taylor]	395
E E Stoll, Shakespeare's Young Lovers [T Spencer]	396
C. S Gutkind, Cosimo de' Medici [F C Lane]	475
L N Broughton (ed), Sara Coleridge and Henry Reed [T M Raysor]	475
G E Noyes, Bibliography of Courtesy and Conduct Books in Seven- teenth-Century England. [W L Ustick.]	476
F Lot, Joseph Bédier [C Ruutz-Rees.]	554
M Françon (ed), <i>Poèmes de transition</i> [W L Wiley.]	555
Deferrari, Barry, McGuire, A Concordance to Ovid [H. C Lancaster]	556
H Muchnic, Dostoevsky's English Reputation [C R Decker.]	624
E G Cox, Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel [G B Parks]	625
M H. Braaksma, Travel and Literature [G. B. Parks.]	625
Essays and Studies (Allahabad). [V. Lang.]	626
W F Schirmer, Geschichte der englischen Literatur. [K. Malone]	626
L P Brown, Some Romance Words of Arabic or Germanic Origin [L Spitzer]	627
W Müller, Die Grundbegriffe der gesellschaftlichen Welt in den Werken des Abbé Prévost [G. R Havens]	627
E Brennecke, Jr, John Milton the Elder and his Music [C S. Smith]	628
H Baker, Induction to Tragedy. [T. Brooke]	629
F Olivero, Francis Thompson (D. Milani, trans) [K. Neill.]	630
H. Sparnaay, Hartmann von Aue [C Selmer.]	631
J G Hartman, The Development of American Social Comedy. [N B Fagyn.]	632
M W Kastendieck, England's Musical Poet, Thomas Campion. [G R. Potter]	632

CONTENTS

x1

CORRESPONDENCE

	PAGE
L Spitzer, <i>Zèbre</i>	78
J C Corson, Scott's <i>Battle of Kilmecranke</i>	235
L Spitzer, Nochmals <i>Die Sonne geht zu Gnaden</i>	236
L Spitzer, G Rohlf's (<i>ANS</i> , clxxiii, 133)	236
L Spitzer, Robert A Hall, Jr (<i>Language</i> , 14 154)	237
M Kessl, Corrections to the Shields Bibliography of Italian Transla- tions	397
D C Allen, Melbrancke and Gosson	398
H Mutschmann, An Answer to Dr Tillyard	398
L Spitzer, It <i>bravo</i> —all <i>Polier</i> —fr <i>camée</i> —all <i>Schamotte</i>	633

THIS VOLUME IS DEDICATED TO
WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
CO-EDITOR OF MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES SINCE 1916
IN HONOR OF HIS SIXTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY
JANUARY 17, 1939

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIV

JANUARY, 1939

Number 1

THE COMPARATIVE AND SUPERLATIVE SUFFIXES -ER- -EST- AND -ÔR- -ÔST- IN NOTKER'S WORKS¹

The two suffixes used in Old High German (and in the other Germanic dialects as well) in the formation of the degrees of comparison of the adjective are already found in Gothic *-iz-an -is-ta*, *-ôz-an -ôs-ta*, the former is the general form and is Indo-European (cf. ἡδίων > *ḡd-iw-on), the latter is Germanic only, and probably owes its origin to adverbs in *-ô* (cf. *snumundô* 'quickly'²) to which the comparative and superlative *(i)z-*, *(i)st-* have been added.³ This new Germanic suffix is in Gothic still restricted to the so-called *a*-stems, but in OHG that is no longer the case, the two suffixes apparently being used interchangeably. What complicates things in OHG is the fact that *o* or *e* or *i* (*ungiro*, *ungero-iungoro*) may be, and in many cases actually is, a short vowel due to assimilation or a new, inserted (svarabhakti) vowel.⁴ But Notker makes it perfectly clear that the *o* is a long vowel by placing a circumflex accent (*-ôr-*, *-ôst-*) on it. He furthermore makes a clear distinction in the distribution of the suffixes *-er-* *-est-* and *-ôr-* *-ôst-*, in that he limits the former to monosyllabic adjectives and the latter to dissyllabic or polysyllabic. Whether this distinction goes back further than Notker it is difficult to say for the aforementioned reasons.

¹ In as much as the new edition of Notker's works by T. Starck and myself is not yet finished, all references are to Piper's

² Cf. *Studies in Honor of H. Collitz*, p. 97

³ Cf. Brugmann, *Vergl. Gramm.*, II, § 438

⁴ Cf. Schatz, *Althochd. Gramm.*, § 395

LIST OF ADJECTIVES

älter- (9) ⁵	ältest- (4)	ärger- (2)	argest- (2)
älterôr- (1)	altist- (1)		argist (1)
altr- (1)		armer- (1)	
bälder- (1)			
bézer- (34)	bézeit- (10)		prôdest- (1)
bézzet- (22)	bézzest- (4)	dîcher- (1)	tîcheest- (1)
pézeror- (2)			tûnnest- (1)
dûrfter- (1)		énger- (1)	
	éiginhaftist- (1)		
êrhâfter- (1)	êrhâftest- (1)		
féster- (2)		frécher- (1)	
frier- (1)			
ûnfrier- (2)			fréwist (1)
fôller- (1)		frûoter- (1)	
	uêrrist- (1)		
gânzer- (1)			
ûngânzer- (1)		kefrâder (1)	
	gemachest- (1)		gengest- (2)
gerécher- (3)		geróber- (1)	gerobust (1)
	gesprâchest- (1)	gesûnder- (1)	
gelicher- (4)	gelfichist- (1)		glatest- (1)
ûngelicher (1)	ungolfichest- (1 MSS		gnôtest- (12)
	A, B)		gnôtist- (1)
	grûonest- (1)		cnôtest (1)
guisser- (5)			
quisser- (3)	quissist- (2)		
ûnguisser- (2)			
guissagiôr- (1)		héiter- (1)	
hóher- (4)	hóhest- (26)		hérttest- (1)
	hóhist- (2)		heizest- (1)
	hóist- (2)	rûnger- (6)	rûngest- (20)
châlder- (1)			rûngist- (4)
	chîuskest- (1)		rugest- (1, Gl)
chléiner- (2)		chûnder- (3)	
chûrzer- (1)	chûrzeit- (1)	lénger- (3)	léngeist- (2)
	chûrzist- (4)	ûnlenger- (1)	
léider- (2)			lézeit- (1)
lieber- (16)	liebest- (2)		
liebr- (2)		liehter- (3)	
lôser- (1)		lînder- (2)	
lûtsamer- (1)		lûtreister- (1)	
lûkker- (2)		mînnesamer- (1)	

⁵ The figures in brackets refer to the number of occurrences

mitter- (1)			mârist- (2)
nâher- (2)	nahest- (3)	nâmer- (1)	
	nâist- (1)	nûzzer- (2)	
	nâmohaftest- (1)	nûzer- (1)	
	nâmohaftist- (1)	órdinhâfter- (1)	
rêiner- (1)		richer- (1)	richest- (1)
rédohâfter- (1)		rêhter- (5)	rehtest- (2)
		únrehter- (3)	
sârfer- (1)		séltsâner- (1)	
síchurer- (1)		scádohâfter- (1)	
smâher- (2)		snéller- (2)	
semfter- (2)		stâter- (1)	
únsémfter- (2)			
suârer- (1)		scôner- (3)	scônest (1)
stârchei- (9)	stârchest- (3)		scômst- (4)
sûozer- (2)		tiefer- (4)	
sûozzer- (2)		tíurer- (6)	tíurest- (3)
sûozzir- (1, Gl)			diurest- (1)
úngemâzer- (1)			túmbest- (1)
	úngeszânest- (1)		
uuârer- (8)		uuârmer- (1)	
uueicher- (2)		uuélcher- (2)	uuélchest- (1)
uuérder- (3)			
únuuérder- (1)		uufiser- (4)	
uufter- (2)	uuftest- (1)	zufualter- (1)	
	zéichenhaftest- (1)	únzufuáalter- (1)	
zórfter- (1)			zéizest- (1)
			frûost- (2)
			uuirsest- (7)
		uuirser- (6)	uuirsist- (6)
<hr/>			
ántszâzigôr- (1)		chúnnigor- (1)	chúnnigost- (1)
chréftigor- (1)	chréftigost- (1)	chunnigôro (MS B)	
		chúnnigêro (MS A)	
únfréisigor- (1)	émezigost- (1)		êruuirdigost- (1)
úngeuuáltigôr- (1)	fréisigost- (1)	fernumistigor- (1)	
ínuuertigor- (1)	geuuáltigost- (4)	héungor- (1)	héungost (1)
máhtigor- (3)	máhtigost- (2)	héunger- (1)	
únmáhtigôr- (1)		mánigor- (2)	mánigost- (1)
máhtiger- (2)		mániger- (2)	
máhtiger- (1)		máneger- (1)	
	rehtscúldigost- (1)		
sâligor- (5)	sâligost- (1)		
únsâligor- (1)		spûotiger- (1)	

stréde-uuálligor- (1)		
uuehselhôr- (1)		uuilligor (1)
uurigôr- (1)		uurdigôr- (1)
	zâlgôst- (2)	zimigost (1)
zuüeliger- (1, AB)		
	trizzegost- (1)	sehzigost- (1)
	cênzegost- (1)	sibinzegost- (1)
	zêhinzegost- (1)	
<hr/>		
hândegor- (1)	handegost- (3)	(mâneger- (1))
uuênegor- (4)	uuênegost- (2)	
<hr/>		
zâgor- (1)	zâgost- (3)	húldigar- (1, Gl)
<hr/>		
ânderlichôr- (1)		bûrlicher- (1, Gl) buulichost- (2)
gelóublichôr- (2)		fólleglicher (1) fólleglichost- (1)
	geuuachtlichost- (1)	gerístlicher- (1)
hírelchor- (1)		húgelicher- (1) húgelichost- (1)
	námolichost- (1)	uuêlicher- (1) uuêlichost- (1)
	tûomlichost- (1)	
uuúnderlicher- (1)		
uuúnderlicher- (1)		
<hr/>		
	éigenost- (1)	éichenost- (5)
feruuórfenôr- (1)	feruuórfenost- (1)	
ueruuórfener- (1)		inbundenôr- (1)
tóugenor- (1)		
túnchelôr- (2)		mittelost- (2)
uuácherôr- (2)		lûterôr- (2)
síchurer- (1)		únlûterer- (1)
<hr/>		
	geêretost- (1)	ferchrôndost- (1)
		gelêrtost- (1)
		ungeuuártost- (1)
		fertânost- (1)
<hr/>		
	ébenest- (1)	édelest- (1)
<hr/>		

A mere glance at the list of words that form the comparative and superlative degrees in *-ôr-*, *-ost-* will reveal that the bulk are adjectives in *-ig* and *-li(c)h*. (Only a small proportion of them to

be sure are here compared, for a fairly complete list see Graff, *Althochd Sprachschatz*, II, 105-109 and IV, 6-8) This observation offers the explanation for the restriction of the *-ôr-*, *-ôst-* forms to words of more than one syllable. It is a fact that adjectives in OHG *-lîh* (Goth. *-leik*) are particularly susceptible to the formation of adverbs of manner in *-lîhho* (*-lîcho*),⁶ the comparative and superlative forms of which appear as *-lîhhôr*, *-lîhhôst*. Not as numerous are the adverbs in *-igo* from adjectives in *-ig* (*mahtig* etc.⁷), but numerous enough to give together with those in *-lîhho* a decided preponderance of dissyllabic (polysyllabic) forms.

The extension of *-ôr-*, *-ôst-* in polysyllabic adjectives was further aided by rhythmic factors. Notker observes a law of the shortening of a vowel in a syllable following the stressed one when a third syllable is added which has a long vowel (*glôublih - glôublichôren*, *hêrlig - hêrligêr*)⁸ There is thus produced a rhythmic succession of short, unaccented and long, accented syllables. Notker had a keen ear and it is not surprising to find him aware of this fact. A natural result of this development was that dissyllabic words with a light, unstressed final syllable, as *feruûôrfen*, *tûnchel*, *lûter* etc. also had to take the heavy suffix *-ôr-*, *-ôst-*. We have a similar situation in Greek, in which adjectives with a short radical syllable like σοφός 'wise' form the comparative and superlative in *-ώτερος* and *-ώτατος* instead of *-ότερος*, *-οτατος* because of the rhythm. The origin must have been just as in OHG the adverb σοφῶς, σοφώτερον, σοφώτατα in which there was a regular alternation of short and long syllables, which was then carried over to the adjective.

An apparent exception to the rhythmic law is that the heavy suffixes *-hâft*, *-fâlt*, *-sâm*, *-sân*, *-rést* have not yet become a mere formative termination like *-lîh* and therefore retain the stress (note acute accent), but for that can have only the light comparative and superlative forms *-er-*, *-est-*; again a nice balance between accented and unaccented syllables.

A second exception, which is also only apparent, is that the superlative degree of past participial adjectives with a long radical syllable is formed by adding *-ôst-* instead of *-est-* *ferchrônôdosta* I 761, 13, *gelêrtôsten* I 65, 24; *ungeuûártôsta* I, 696, 11, but if

⁶ Cf Wilmanns, *Deutsche Gramm*, II, §§ 361, 441, 4

⁷ Cf Grimm, *Deutsche Gramm*, III, 112

⁸ Cf *ZfdPh*, XIV, 165 ff

we bear in mind that these forms are contractions of *ferchrônet*-, *gelêrtet*-, *ungeuârtet*-, whereas a verb of the third weak conjugation (inf. *-ên*) has correctly *geêretostûn* I 679, 18, with the *e* of the pp ending shortened according to rule, the difficulty at once disappears. This fact seems to lend support to the view that the rhythmic law is older than Notker. To the analogy of these verbal adjectives the monosyllables *fertânosten* II 254, 11 with *-ôst* probably owes its origin.

Dissyllabic adjectives in *-en* and *-el* with short radical syllable preserve the old superlative ending *-est* *êbenesten* I 284, 10; *êdelesta* I 97, 14. For one word *zâgora* I 239, 27, *zâgôsten* I 105, 24, 31; 145, 22 I have not been able to find an explanation. It is the only monosyllabic form apart from the above-mentioned *fertânosten* in *-ôr*-, *-ôst*-. The word is according to Kluge-Gotze a "junge Nachbildung zum Subst. mhd zage, ahd zago 'Feigling,' wozu weiter mhd. ahd zaghaft" (cf. Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterb.* s. v.).

The other exceptions may all be traced to scribes. *chûnnigêro* I 463, 29 in MS A is clearly a scribal error as MS B with *chûnnigôro* shows, the circumflex on the *e* can only be understood if we assume that it has been substituted for *o*. *hêungero* II 410, 10 is a gloss, as is likewise *bûrlucherin* II 363, 9 and therefore cannot be attributed to Notker. *-era* in *mâhtigera* I 341, 10 in the sentence: *Tîsu chrâft îst kefrâdera. ûnde fîlo mâhtigera* is a case of assimilation to the preceding adjective. Similarly to be judged, although the adjective follows, is I 796, 19, *Dâz fîur îst sô fîlo mâhtigera. sô iz chléineren geziuges îst*. Note in both sentences the circumflex on the *i* with following light suffix. In I 237, 10 we have: *uûederêr dêro dûnchet tîr der mâhtigero?* Three lines further we read *Uuânda nîoman nezûuelôt. nûbe dér mâhtigoro sî*. Whether it is absolutely wrong to assign the *-igero* to Notker it is naturally impossible to say categorically, but in view of the fact that the preponderance of adjectives in *-ig*- form the comparative and superlative in *-ôr*- and *-ôst*-, the weight of evidence points clearly in that direction. *zuûeligerin* in the *Categories* I 431, 13 occurs in this form in both MSS, but the ending *-in* is not Notker's. The only other exception is *spûotigera* in *De Interpretatione* I 506, 27.

. Of the three occurrences of *mânig*-(*mâneg*)-*eren* two occur in the *Psalms* in the translation of identical Latin verses, and one

in the *Categories* (MSS A and B). In as much as the suffix *-eg-* derives from *-ag-* (cf. Goth *manag-*) and *-ig-* may owe its *i* (N.B. without circumflex accent) to the influence of *-ig-* before a heavy ending, it is difficult to say whether the *-er-* or *-ôr-* comparative suffixes are the regular Notker forms, but since the superlative has *-ôst-* (cf. *mânigôston* II 378, 14), I am inclined to consider the latter as such.

The few *-licher-* forms are to be similarly interpreted as the *-iger-*, *Boethius* I 189, 16, assimilation *nemág nieht táz uuêrera sî. nôh táz rêdohâftera sî nôh táz kôte geristlîcherâ sî*, I 345, 9: *tero guisserûn ûnde dero fôlleghcherûn ertêlungo* (cf. superl. *fôlleghchosta* I 774, 10), *Mart Cap* I 758, 2 *Uuâz îst hûgelîcherâ ûnde mînnesamera uuîne?* (cf. superl. *Boethius* I 171, 15 *hûgelîchôsta*) Scribal is probably also *uuêlîcherâ* in *Boethius* I 254, 25 (cf. 266, 28 superl. *uuêlîchôsta*) as is *uuûnderlîcherâ* in *Psalms* II 503, 20 (cf. II 279, 24 *uuûnderlîchorâ*). That the scribes actually did change the suffix is seen in *Mart Cap* I 768, 15 *nâmolîchosten*, where the *o* is corrected out of *e*. In *De Musica* I 852, 29 *gerobustun* is incorrectly written for *gerôbestûn* (cf. compar. *gerobero* I 852, 24). *hûldîgaro Psalms* II 381, 15 is a gloss and besides as a translation of *placabilis* we should expect the positive degree of the adjective. Once in *Boethius* I 147, 13 we find *ueruuôrfenêro* but 170, 28 *feruuôrfenôra* and 163, 21 *feruuôrfenôsten*, again scribal form as in 147, 1 *ketûen* for *ketûon*. The *-era* in *sîchurera* I 27, 27 is doubtful. To be sure we should expect in a dissyllabic word *-ôr-* (**sîchurôra*), but if the *u* retained the strong secondary accent of the original (Lat. *sēcūrus*; cf. *sîchûre* I 96, 20) the lighter comparative suffix may be correct. However, I question this (cf. *ZfdA.*, LXX, 260). A scribal error is responsible for *guissagiôra* (*promptior*) in *Mart. Cap* I 693, 22 for **guissera* (cf. *ZfdA.*, XXX, 341). In three places in the *Psalms*, two of them in the glosses, the scribe has elided the *e* of *-er-* in monosyllabic words: *altrun* II 330, 22 (G1), *liebra* II 46, 16, 266, 10 (G1).

Of special interest is the function of the so-called double comparative suffix *-erôr-*. Notker distinguishes between *fôrder-*, *hînder-*, *mêr-*, *nîder-*, *ôber-*, *ûnder-*, which he uses in an absolute sense, and *fôrderôr-*, *hînderôr-* etc., in a real relative sense. *Tien fôrderên rêdôn nemág îh uuîdere sîn chād îh. ûnde dîsa sîderûn sîho îh in nôte fôlgên* I 187, 16, *Îh mêmo. dâz ter ôbero sîn begrîfet ten*

níderen I 337, 1, *Sô gíbet iô daz ôbera sînen námen demo únderen* I 376, 10, *mîn hîndero téil (inferior pars mea)* II 42, 9, *Téro sígeêrôn uuâren zuô dru mînnerna únde dru mêra* I 75, 13.—*Tero ménniskôn natura íst sô getân táz si . . . ánderên dîngen fôrderôra sî Únde áber dien tíeren hînderôra sî.* I 95, 10, *Uuánda ér íst in sînero ábsida ôfto ôberôro dero súnnun ôfto níderôro.* I 799, 20, *Múgent ír uuêrden mêrôren dânnne hélfendâ stárcheren dânnne fârre?* I, 164, 17, *Tánegágene sînt ánderu dru ána álde in demo únderen sînt s. uuánda síu accdentia sînt. únde uóne únderôrên gespróchen nesînt s. uuánda síu sînt sêlben dru únderôsten* I 373, 2 Into this group has been drawn the adjective *ált*, the regular comparative of which is *álter*-, but the absolute comparative meaning as we have it e. g. in the word 'Eltern (parents)' or in the expression 'eine altere Dame' as contrasted with 'eine alte Dame' brings it into the category of the above-mentioned *fôrder*- etc., and we are not surprised to find the double form *álterôr*-. *Sô sînt ánderu dîng. tíu dru tát hábent sámînt tero máhte. tero tát íst natúrlichô fôrderôra (sc. dânnne dru máht). iro máht íst áber álterôra (sc. dânnne dru tát)* I 578, 21. In two places in the *Categories* the scribe of MS B, unaware of this difference in the use of the shorter and longer forms, wrongly substituted the shorter (*pézero*) for the correct longer forms as found in MS A; I 441, 18. *Uuêz er guísso dâz tíser mán bézero íst sámô guísso uuêz ér uuês pézerora ér íst* 441, 25. *Uuêz er áber æneam pézeren sô únguísso. táz er dén nebechénnnet. tés pézerora ér sî.* (cf. *Categories* I 422, 1).

I must here forego a further discussion of the comparative in Notker. I believe, however, that I have considered the most important aspects of the problem.

EDWARD H. SEHRT

George Washington University

DIE SONNE GEHT ZU GNADEN

Professor Leo Spitzer in *MLN.*, 1937, p. 506 f. explains this old phrase for the setting of the sun as meaning originally the dying of the sun. He quotes from the *Schweizerisches Idiotikon* the phrase 'zu Gnaden gehen' in the sense of dying, he also cites the

Rumanian phrase *soarele asfinţeste*, 'die Sonne geht unter' with the comment of Şameanu "das Verschwinden oder der anscheinende Tod der Sonne ist als eine Heiligung des Gestirns angesehen." Assuming that this explains the German phrase he continues "Der 'Tod der Sonne' ist verklart durch ein christliches Wiederaufstehen in schoneren Spharen, die ihren Abglanz auf die Erde senden. Die Sonne kann fur den Christen nicht anders als 'fromm,' 'in Gnaden' sterben." He also suggests the halo of the saints and quotes from Grimm's *Mythologie* (p. 601 and p. 269) cap. 45 of Tacitus' *Germania* which states that the setting of the sun "so lichten Glanz hinter sich [lasse], dass er bis zum Morgen die Sterne bleiche . . . formas deorum et radios capitis aspici," "die strahlenden Haupter seien gleichsam ein Heiligeschein." It is difficult to detect any connection between this passage and the German phrase under discussion.

Romantic Karl Moor in Schiller's *Rauber* on beholding the setting sun exclaims "So stirbt ein Held" (Act III, sc. 2), but in German folk tradition we do not find a particle of evidence that the Germans ever looked upon the setting of the sun as the death or the dying of the sun. In Stegemann's long article on 'Sonne' in the *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, VIII, 36 ff. we find that the sun was sometimes conceived as a sort of divine person but never as dying. The phrase 'die Sonne geht zu Golde' was misunderstood among the Bohemians "dass die Sonne zu Gott gehe" (die Sunne geht zu Goute, col. 57), but even that does not necessarily imply dying. More striking perhaps is the list of phrases found in different parts of Germany and at different periods for the setting of the sun collected by Jakob Grimm in chapter XXIII (including 'Nachtrage') of his *Mythologie*⁴. Not one of these phrases contains the remotest suggestion that the setting of the sun was conceived as a process of dying.

The phrase is quite common in the older German, especially in the 15th and 16th centuries, and seems to be confined to Upper and Middle German. Fischer's *Schwabisches Wörterbuch*, the *Schweizerisches Idiotikon*, Schmeller's *Bayrisches Wörterbuch* record passages, but not the *Elsassisches Wörterbuch* of Martin and Lienhart, though Alsatian authors use the phrase. Cf. Wickram, *Goldfaden*, 1557, p. 269⁶ (ed. Bolte) biss auff den Abent, das die sonn zu genaden greng, also p. 282¹¹; Jacob Frey, *Gartengesellschaft*, 1557, p. 28²⁸ (ed. Bolte) die sonn was zu gnaden gangen,

also in his *Fastnachtspiel* (*ibid.*, p. xix). Sanders gives from Kaisersberg's *Postill* 'die Sonne geht zu Naden.' One of the three instances in Grimm's *Weistümer* (I, 744) is also taken from an Alsatian source. The examples from the dialect dictionaries should be supplemented by chapter xxiii of Grimm's *Mythologie*.

Grimm (*loc cit.*, p. 617) quotes the following passage from Agricola's *Sprachwörter* (737) "es werete biss die sonne wolt zu gnaden gen i. e. undergehn und der welt ir gnade und schein versagen und zu ruhe gehen." This 16th century writer knows that the meaning of the phrase is 'zu Ruhe gehen,' though the rest of his explanation is confused. On the same page Grimm quotes an equally interesting passage from Aventin's *Chronik* (1580, 19b). I quote the whole passage: "Dergleichen haben sie (unser Alt-vatter) ein Weib, Fraw Sonnen/in die zahl der untodlichen Gotter geschrieben/sie eine Königin des Himmels/nach ir den Tag/Liecht/und den ersten Tag genennt . . . dorfft keiner sagen/sie gienge unter/must sprechen/sie gieng zu rost (i. e. rest) und gnaden/wie dann noch etwan das narrisch gemein Volck meint."¹ We may infer from this that the expression was in wide use among the common people in the 16th century. 'Zu rost und gnaden' is one of those phrases characteristic of the older German style in which two semantically related words are combined with und. Gnaden here means essentially the same as rest. A double phrase we also find in *Dietrichs Flucht*, l. 1166: nu wolt diu sunne ze reste und ouch ze gemache nider gân, where gemache with its abstract MHG sense is the equivalent of reste.

Gnade in the sense of rest is well established for the older German and for other Germanic languages. Graff's *Ahd Sprachschatz* does not offer a clear case for this meaning. Paul Wahmann in his monograph *Gnade. Der althochdeutsche Wortschatz im Bereich der Gnade, Gunst und Liebe* (Berlin, 1937) cites a great many examples of OHG gnada, but as they are all taken from religious writings they have a Christian meaning with a few exceptions of secular usage, but he has no example of gnada in the sense of rest. Muller-Zarncke and Lexer give examples for MHG, e. g. *Iwein*, l. 5944 f. ich suoche einen man/unz ich den nicht funden han,/so muoz ich gnâde und ruowe lân. Schiller-Lubben's *Mnd. Wb.* gives two examples: Sint in den steden de lude sik moghen mit vrede,

¹ In the Neudruck of the works of Aventin published by the Bayrische Akademie the passage is found vol IV, p. 89

mit ghenaden gheneren mit eren arbeyde (*Wigands Arch.*, II, 9); wen ik schol minen schipper loven, so begint it (das Kind) so sere to doven, dat ik dat môt underwegen lân, wil ik ienige gnade hân (*Zeno* 438) In Middle Netherlandish, too, genad in the sense of rest is known. Cf Verwijs and Verdam, *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek*, II, 1379 where several examples are given. ON náð is frequently used in the sense of rest, especially in the plural náðir. Fritzner's *Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog* after giving examples for náðir in the sense of 'rest at night, sleep' quotes our German phrase as having the same meaning. It should be pointed out that in the German 'Gnade' is in the plural, just as in ON the plural náðir is generally used in the sense of rest. In Old Swedish naadh, noodh in this sense is common and also appears frequently in the plural. Soderwall's *Ordbok ofver Svenska Medeltids-Språket* gives about a dozen examples for this meaning, among them such combinations as fridh oc nadher, nadher eller ro, 1 fridh ok nadhom.

There are numerous other expressions in German and related languages that make it perfectly clear that the setting of the sun was conceived as a going to rest. Many of them are given by Grimm, *Mythologie*⁴, pp. 584 ff and III, 216 ff. From his *Wörterbuch* (II, 453) he quotes "e die sonne gesasse" and from II, 490 "bis die Sonne gesitzt," i. e. the sun sits down to rest. The conception is the basis of the English 'sunset.' From the older Germanic Grimm (*loc cit.*, p. 616) cites OHG sedal-kanc, OE setel-gong, setl-rād, to sete glīdan, OS sêg sunne te sedle Hel. 2820, geng sunna tī sedle *ibid.* 3423; from later Danish solen ganger til senge, the sun goes to bed, solen gik til hvile, the sun went to rest; from MHG diu sunne gerte lāzen sich zuo reste, die sunne do ze reste gie. Schiller-Lubben, III, 535 gives 'int westen, tha de sunne gheyt tho rusthe.' The *DWB* cites 'wenn die sonne . . . zu ruste gehet' from Mathesius and a similar phrase from Opitz. Modern authors also use the phrase; cf Musaeus, *Volksmärchen*, I, 22 (ed. 1818) ehe die Sonne zu Ruste geht. 'Die Sonne geht zur Rast' is found in Lamprecht von Regensburg, in *Teuerdank* and in Hans Sachs (cf. *DWB* s. v. Rast 4) Grimm quotes from the older English 'until the sun was gone to rest' The sun is supposed to be weary at the end of the day. Wolfram refers to the setting sun as 'diu muede sunn,' *Parz.* I, 954 The figure has been used by modern poets. Grillparzer: (Sonne) 'die täglich,

hat sie sich mude gewandelt, zur Ruhe geht in unserm Meere' (*Das goldne Vlies, Argonauten*, Act I). Jean Paul, *Flegeljahre*, I, 28 'obgleich die tiefe laue Sonne noch ein mudes Rot . . . um die Scheiben legt' (*DWb* s. v. mude 2) d).

Similar phrases are 'de Sunne woll to Bedde,' Firmenich, *Germanens Volkerstimmen*, I, 329^a (from a Low German poem from Waldeck); 'de sunne geit to gade,' *Bremisches Wb.*, I, 474, which means 'to go to one's chamber to rest.' From MHG Grimm quotes 'do diu sunne ze gaden solde gan.' The *DWb* gives a passage from the 17th century 'wenn die sonne ze gaden gegangen ist' (s. v. Gaden 2) b). This expression is also found in Middle Netherlandish. Verwijs and Verdam have the following statement under Gademe (*Mnl. Wb.*, II, 863). I translate: "Gadem 2) 'chamber, room,' in restricted meaning 'bedroom.' Hence the expression te gademe (gadem, gaden) gaen, to go to bed, to go to sleep, in reference to the sun, to go down. So also High German, e. g. Grimm, wenn die Sonne ze Gadem gegangen ist. . . This expression, a survival of high antiquity, was no longer understood and gave rise to all sorts of corruptions, the phrase to gode gaen probably stands for to godem gaen." Te gode gaen (comen), te gode sijn in reference to the sun means to go down, to be down (*Mnl. Wb.*, II, 2007). The following comment is added: "Gode in this expression has probably nothing to do with God (the word is nearly always written with a small initial) but has become unrecognizable through popular etymology, but what the original meaning is, is not certain." The authors suggest connection with godem (gadem) or with gold and refer to MHG zu gold gân, in (fur) gold gân and the MLG to golde gân. 'Te hove gaen' is also a not uncommon expression in Middle Netherlandish for the setting of the sun. (Cf. *Mnl. Wb.*, III, 491.)

A few times we find 'under' before 'ze genaden.' Grimm, *Weistumer*, III, 510: e diu sunne under zu genaden gienge, the same we find in a *Weistum* quoted in Grimm's *Deutsche Rechtsaltertumer*⁴, I, 52. Here the idea of going down is doubly expressed, before the sun went down—to rest.

Though the *Schweizerisches Idiotikon* records the phrase ze Gnaden gan in the sense of sterben, we are not justified in applying this meaning to the sun. For the *Schweizerisches Idiotikon* states distinctly that the phrase in this sense is used of human beings. The phrase can only refer to the death of a Christian.

The MHG phrase *diu sêle fuor zen gnâden* is rendered by Müller-Zarncke with 'zu ihrer ewigen Ruh.' A corresponding phrase is found in Middle Netherlandish, *ter genaden gaen* (also *ter genaden varen, sijn*) used of a dying person or a departed one. The *Middel-nederlandsche Woordenboek* believes this to be an abbreviation of *ter Gods gnaden gaen* and hesitates to connect it with *genade* in the sense of rest, though it admits the possibility of this interpretation (II, 1380). Lexer, like Müller-Zarncke, explains *genâde* in phrases like *diu sêle ze genâden kam, ze genâden ist sîn sêle, die himelischen genâde* with 'ruhige Lage, Behagen, Glück, Glückseligkeit' It is hardly possible to decide whether in these phrases *genâde* meant rest or whether from the very beginning of Christian usage *genâde* meant divine grace or favor, but as the word occurs in the sense of rest in Middle High German, Middle Low German, Middle Netherlandish and Old Norse there can be no doubt that it must have had that meaning also in Old High German.

Our phrase considered by itself can only mean the sun goes to rest, for *Gnade* and its plural in the old language meant rest, considered in connection with the numerous related expressions the evidence is overwhelming that this must be the meaning and that it cannot refer to the dying of the sun. We must return to the explanation given by Jakob Grimm many years ago.

JOHN A. WALZ

Harvard University

AN UNPUBLISHED BALLAD-TRANSLATION BY SCOTT, *THE BATTLE OF KILLIECRANKIE*

On February 21, 1807, Walter Scott wrote Robert Surtees.

I wonder what other ballads Mr Ritson intended to insert in the little collection. The Latin song, which you mention as a favourite of the old hero of 1745, was probably Kennedy's *Praelium Gillecrankiense*, in leonine Latin, which I translated into doggerel verse, at Ritson's instance, and for his collection. If Mr Frank wishes to have those verses which are alluded to in Mr R's letter to me, I will send them. They are absolute doggerel, but very literal.

This translation must have been made some four years earlier, for in a letter to Ritson of September 11, 1803, Scott writes.

Your criticism on the translation of Killiecrankie verse 8th¹ is quite just pray let it run thus

He left the boar on Speys bleak shore
 He left the wolf at bay
 The whiggish race like hares to chase
 And course the false Mackay

I inclose in this packet Pennicuikes² poems from which I have rendered Kennedy's poem

Through the kind permission of the Morgan Library I am able to print "the original Holograph Manuscript of an Unpublished Poem by Walter Scott," *The Battle of Killiecrankie*, presented by Scott to A. G. Hunter of Blackness in 1805. Hunter's MS note at the end of the 3½ quarto pages runs as follows

The above translation was made by, & is in the handwriting of Walter Scott Esq^r and was presented by him to me—being intended to accompany an Engraved Port^t of Lord Dundee, from the Orig^l Picture in the possession of the Duke of Montrose, which I had been the means of obtaining from the Miss Youngs of Auldbar in Angus, (for His Grace,)—in whose Family it had remained upwards of a century—And is, so far as I have been able to learn, the only Genuine Port^t of Lord Dundee, known to exist—

This spirited Effusion has never yet been published nor do I believe Mr Scott has any other copy of it

Novemb^r 1811 Alex^r G Hunter

I got it from W S about six years ago—i e 1805

As far as I can determine, Hunter appears right in considering the piece never to have been published, though there is always the possibility that it may have appeared in some contemporary collection.

Since Scott's poem is a translation, Kennedy's Latin original in Pennecuik's *Collection* may be included also for the sake of comparison. Such a comparison should justify Hunter's description of the English piece as a "spirited Effusion" rather than its

¹"With respect to the eighth [stanza] I know not what to say without applying to yourself with great humility for another line if the present rhyme cannot be rendered more analogous

To course like stags the Lowland Whigs

this my dear Sir, cannot remain for your own sake all the rest being conceived in your usual fluency which I have ever regarded with pleasure and admiration"—Ritson to Scott, 2nd July, 1803.

²Pennecuik's (Alex) *Collection of Scots Poems*, 1769, is in the Abbotsford Library. [This and the preceding note are from Grierson's edition of Scott's letters] •

author's own modest allusion to it as "absolute doggerel," for Scott skillfully brings out all the details of the original, yet heightens the effect with elaborations of his own,—and particularly by the use of the clanging internal rhymes changes a respectable performance in the Latin into a dashing battle lyric in the English.

To A G Hunter of Blackness from
Walter Scott Esq^r

Alexander Pennecuik, *Collection of
Scots Poems*, 1769⁴

The Battle of Killiecrankie
Translated from the Latin

Praehum Gilliecrankium
Cantilena

Gramius notabilis colligerat mon-
tanos &

I

1

The glorious Graeme of deathless
fame

Grahamius notabilis coegerat Mon-
tanos,

Brought down his mountain band
The southern race in route they
chace

Qui clypeis α gladius fugarunt
Anglicanos

Claymore and targe in hand
The Lowland prig and canting whig
In headlong flight were roll'd
In foul retreat the Dutch be——t
Their breeches manifold³

Fugerant Vallicolae atque Puritani,
Cacavere Batavi α Cameroniani

II

11

O wondrous Graeme! Herculean
frame

Grahamius mirabilis, fortissimus
Alcides,

And Faith unstained by fear!
Thou well couldst fire to deeds of
ire

Cujus regi fuerat intemerata fides,
Agiles monticolas marte inspiravit,
Et duplicatum numerum hostium
profigavit

The agile mountaineer
Though twice thy force opposed thy
course

In deep and dark array
Yet swept thy sword the foreign
Lord

And stranger race away

³ The last two lines of this first stanza have been scratched out with heavy black ink, not Scott's, yet, except for the first three words, they are easily decipherable "Retreat" is the suggestion of Mr R B Haselden of the Huntington Library

⁴ This piece has been printed by Mr J L Weir in *Notes and Queries* of January 22, 1938, p 60 The version here given corresponds to the volume in the library of Harvard

III

Of noble birth & nobler worth
 A Peer of old renown
 His blade so true Dumferline drew
 And hewd the traitors down
 With heart of faith and hand of
 death
 Old Scotlands Hector gray
 O'er helms of steel through ranks
 that reel
 Pitcur led on the way

IV

For James's right Glengary's might
 The field with slaughter strowed
 Not he through fire, who bore his
 sire
 Such zealous duty shewd
 The men of Skye of metal high
 They shared their chieftains
 toils
 Both sire and son to fight rushed on
 Macdonalds of the Isles

V.

Maclean the bold fought as of old
 Amid his martial clan
 From foemen such the tardy Dutch
 With speed unwonted ran
 The stout Lochiel with dirk of steel
 And many a Cameron there
 The Southron fell dispatched to hell
 And bore their spoils to Blair

III

Nobilis apparuit fermilodunensis,
 Cujus in rebelles stringebatur ensis,
 Nobilis \propto sanguine, nobilior virtute,
 Regi devotissimus intus \propto in cute.

IV

Pitcurius heroicus, Hector Scoti-
 canus,
 Cui mens fidelis fuerat, \propto invicta
 manus,
 Capita rebellium is excerebravit,
 Hostes unitissimos ense dissipavit

V

Glengarius magnanimus atque belli-
 cosus,
 Functus ut Aeneas, pro rege ani-
 mosus,
 Fortis atque sternuus hostes ex-
 pugnavit,
 Sanguinerebellum campos coloravit

VI

Surrexerat fideliter Donaldus in-
 sulanus,
 Pugaverat viriliter cum copis Sky-
 anis
 Pater atque filii non dissimulârunt,
 Sed pro rege proprio unanimes
 pugnârunt

VII

MacLeanus, circumdatus tribu
 martiali,
 Semper devinctissimus familiae re-
 gali,
 Fortiter pugnaverat more atavorum,
 Deinde dissipaverat turmas Bata-
 vorum.

VIII

Strenuus Lochielius, multo Came-
 rone,
 Hostes ense peremit, \propto Abrio pug-
 one,

Istos α intrepidus orco dedicavit
Impedimenta hostium Blaro repor-
tavit

VI.

Bara, Glencoe, Keppoch also
And Balloch and his brother
They knew the claims of good King
James
And would not brook another
And Appine too his faulchion drew
With Stuarts brought from far
And Canon sage did guide their rage
And marshall'd all the war

ix

MacNeilus de Bara Glencous Kep-
pochanus,
Ballechinus cum fratre, Stuartus
Appianus,
Pro Jacobo Septimo fortiter gessere,
Pugiles fortissimi feliciter vicere

x

Canonius clarissimus, Gallovidianus,
Acer α indomitus, consilioque sanus,
Ibi dux adfuerat, spectabilis per-
sona,
Nam pro tuenda patria hunc peperit
Bellona

VII

There too was he from Hungary
Who for his prince did come
And turn'd his dirk from faithless
Turk
Gainst falser whigs at home
The tutor sage to battles rage
Clanronalds broadswords brought
And with his clan to act a man
Their stripling Captain fought

xi

Deucalidoni dominum spiraverat
Gradivus,
Nobilis α juvenis, fortis α activus;
Nam, cum nativum principem exu-
lem audiret,
Redit ex Hungaria, ut regi in-
serviret

xii

Illic α adfuerat Tutor Ranaldorum,
Qui strenuè pugnaverat cum copiis
virorum,
Et ipse capitaneus, aetate puerili,
Intentus est ad praelium spiritu
virili

VIII

Glenmorison from wood and glen
A huntsman warrior came
His carbine true to earth he threw
And drew his sword of flame
He left the doe and bounding roe
He left the stag at bay
The whiggish race like deer to chase
And course the false Mackay

xiii

Glenmoristonus junior, optimus bel-
lator,
Subitò jam factus est, hactenus
venator,
Perduelles Whiggeos ut pecora
prostravit,
Ense α fulmineo MacKaum fuga-
vit

IX

While Tummells wave by rock &
cave

From Blair to Tay shall run
Claymore and targe in highland
charge

Shall rout the pike & gun
And you ye true, your blades that
drew

For Scotlands laws & king
In storied lays your deathless praise
Immortal bards shall sing

XIV

Regibus α legibus Scotici con-
stantes,

Vos clypeis α gladius pro principe
pugnantes,

Vestra est victoria, vestra est α
gloria,

In cantu α historia perpes est
memoria

Only a single comment is necessary—in regard to “Canon sage” mentioned at the end of Scott’s sixth stanza. Scott wrote Lord Montagu, March 4, 1819

Hogg is here busy with his jacobite songs I wish he may get handsomely through for he is profoundly ignorant of history and it is an awkward thing to read in order that you may write I give him all the help I can but he sometimes poses me For instance he came yesterday open mouth enquiring what Great dignified Clergyman had distinguished himself at Killiecrankie—not exactly the scene where one would have expected a churchman to shine—and I found with great difficulty that he had mistaken Major General Canon call’d in Kennedy’s latin song *Canonicus Gallovidiensis* for the Canon of a Cathedral *Ex ungue leonem*

The piece appears under the title “*Praehum Gilliecrankianum*” as Song XVIII in *The Jacobite Relics of Scotland*, first series, 1819. Amusingly Hogg writes in his “Notes” to the poem, page 200

“‘*Canonicus clarissimus Gallovidianus*,’ &c by many readers supposed to mean some great Galloway priest who had made a figure in the battle, refers to Colonel Cannon, who was a native of that country”

ALAN LANG STROUT

Texas Technological College

NEW FACTS RELATING TO THE BIOGRAPHY OF
JACQUES CAZOTTE

Previous investigators have already pointed out the following facts concerning the biography of Cazotte (1) that he was born, either in 1719 or 1720, in the city of Dijon, where he attended the Jesuit College and became friendly with Jean-François Rameau and Antoine Bret, (2) that, at an early age, he went to Paris, became a protégé of Maurepas through the influence of his elder brother, the abbé Chrétien-Nicolas Cazotte, and studied to become an officer of the marine, (3) that, as an officer of the marine, he resided in Martinique for a number of years, during which time he was granted one leave to return to Paris; (4) that, after he had permanently returned to France, he found that the letter of credit given him by Père Lavalette for his possessions in Martinique was worthless, and that he was one of those who helped to bring about the downfall of the Jesuits in 1761, (5) that, failing to obtain a pension from the government, he went to live in the village of Pierry and became a devout Martinist, (6) that he was arrested in 1792 for writing violently anti-revolutionary letters and was placed in the prison of the Abbaye Saint-Germain-des-Prés, from which he was rescued, during the September massacres, by the bravery of his daughter, Elisabeth, (7) that he was re-arrested, tried, and guillotined in September, 1792.

A study of other documents pertaining to Cazotte has allowed me to amplify and to add to the above-mentioned groups of facts.

1. Cazotte was born on October 7, 1719, in the parish of Saint-Médard of Dijon.¹ He was the younger of the two sons of Bernard Cazotte and of Marie Taupin Cazotte, a native of the neighboring town of Vitteaux.² His actual place of birth is unknown.³ He

¹ *Registres paroissiaux de la ville de Dijon*, Paroisse Saint-Médard, B 560

² *Loc. cit.*

³ Clément-Janin (*Les vieilles maisons de Dijon* [Dijon, 1890], p. 25) believes that the house located at no. 9 rue Cazotte was the Cazotte home-
stead. There is nothing about this house, however, which indicates that it was the birthplace of Jacques Cazotte (see Foisset, 'Rapport sur les hommes illustres dont la demeure à Dijon est authentiquement connue,' *Mémoires de l'Académie de Dijon*, 2nd series, II [1852-1853], xlv). The street itself was named for Claude-Joseph Cazotte, a nephew of Jacques.

probably attended the Jesuit College of Dijon so that he might be under the watchful eye of an uncle, who was a member of the Society of Jesus⁴ After receiving the degree of *bachelier en droit*,⁵ he was admitted into the body of lawyers of Dijon on July 18, 1740⁶

2. Cazotte seems to have left Dijon for Paris during the last months of 1740 or at the beginning of 1741.⁷ His brother, the abbé, was, at that time, an official of the diocese of Châlons⁸ and was intimate with the comte de Choiseul, the bishop of this diocese. Choiseul introduced Cazotte to Maurepas, who excused his young protégé from serving as an *élève* of the marine, providing that he spend two years learning marine⁹ law at the home of a *procureur*.¹⁰ During this period, Maurepas paid him the sum of 1200 livres, the regular salary of an *élève* for a similar term¹¹ When this period of study was over, he received the *brevet* of an *écrivain ordinaire* on March 1, 1743¹² and started his official duties at Le Havre¹³ In 1744, he was transferred to Brest,¹⁴ but this year marked the beginning of formal hostilities between England and France in the War of the Austrian Succession, and Cazotte served in three or four naval campaigns¹⁵ on board vessels that

⁴ Rouhette and Target fils, *Mémoire sur les demandes formées contre le Général et la Société des Jésuites* (Paris, 1761), p. 10 Rouhette and Target fils were Cazotte's lawyers during his suit against the Jesuits, and it is probable that this memoir was written by Cazotte himself

⁵ *Archives de la Marne*, E 80

⁶ See extract from the *Registres de Parlement*, *Arch. de la Marne*, E 80

⁷ Cazotte (*Œuvres* [Paris, 1817], III, p. 243) states that he left Dijon at the age of nineteen, but he was either approaching or had past his twenty-first birthday

⁸ *Arch. de la Marne*, E 84

⁹ Cazotte states only that he studied law at this time, but since he had already received the degree of *bachelier en droit*, he must have studied the law directly pertaining to his future profession

¹⁰ See 'Mémoire à Mgr le duc de Praslin . . ' and 'Mémoire des services de Cazotte', *Archives nationales*, ^{xx}Colonies E. 66 (Cazotte)

¹¹ *Loc. cit*

¹² *Arch. de la Marne*, E. 80

¹³ See 'Mémoire à Mgr le duc de Praslin . . ' and 'Mémoire des services de Cazotte', *Arch. nat.*, etc

¹⁴ *Loc. cit*

¹⁵ *Loc. cit*

guarded the coasts of Spain and of Africa ¹⁶ One of these campaigns seems to have taken him to Saint Dominique with the squadron of M. de l'Etenduere ¹⁷ On his return from this voyage in 1746, he was stationed at Rochefort in the "détail des approvisionnements des colonies" ¹⁸ On the first day of the following year, he became an *écrivain principal*, ¹⁹ was charged with the duties of *contrôleur aux Iles du Vent* a few months later, ²⁰ and finally, in September, 1747, received orders to embark for Martinique. ²¹

3. En route to Martinique, the English captured the vessel on which Cazotte was a passenger, and his trunks were seized Later, these trunks were reclaimed for Cazotte and confided to a scribe named Beaumont, who sold the effects contained in them for his personal profit. Beaumont was ejected from the service, but Cazotte was never reimbursed for his heavy financial loss ²²

In a letter written at Martinique on September 23, 1748, Cazotte applied for the position of *garde des sceaux* in order to arrange his affairs which his "déplacement, les malheurs de la guerre, et la difficulté en ce pays ont mis en fort mauvais état" ²³ Even at this early date, the relations between Cazotte and his superior officers had become strained, since he stated in his letter that the governor-general and the intendant had recommended others for this position His letter of application was evidently disregarded, but he received the title of *contrôleur* on January 1, 1749 and of *commissaire ordinaire* on April 1, 1750 ²⁴

Shortly after Cazotte received the title of *commissaire*, the French government decided to abandon its defenses on the island of Sainte Lucie. Conforming to the instructions of the intendant, Hurson, Cazotte departed for this island where he took part in the destruction of the fortifications and from where he wrote, on

¹⁶ 'Mémoire à M. de Boynes . . ,' *Arch nat*, xx Colonies E 66 (Cazotte)

¹⁷ *Mémoire à Mgr le duc de Praslin* . . , etc

¹⁸ *Loc cit*, and *Mémoire des services de Cazotte* . . , etc.

¹⁹ *Arch de la Marine*, E 80.

²⁰ *Mém à Mgr le duc de Praslin* . . , etc.

²¹ *Arch nat*, Colonies C⁸A 59

²² *Loc cit*, and *Mém à Mgr le duc de Praslin* . . , etc

²³ *Arch nat*, Colonies C⁸A 58

²⁴ *Arch de la Marine*, E. 80

October 24, 1750, that he was doing his utmost to "ménager les fonds du Roi et sauver ses effects."²⁵ He was, indeed, so conscientious that he spent over 4000 livres of his own funds to hire and to feed additional laborers who would help to speed up the operations.²⁶ He was not reimbursed until considerably later.

Upon his return from Sainte Lucie, Cazotte was directly affected by the greed and lawlessness of his superiors. The intendant, Hurson, had taken possession of his house without deigning to give him any compensation in return. To make matters worse, Cazotte had spent 1000 écus on the house and for gardens around it from which he might draw his subsistence. With these losses, he wrote in a letter of February 17, 1751, he was completely without resources.²⁷ A few months later, he complained that he had received no gratification for his services up to 1751.²⁸ Even after this date, he was given only the salary of an *écrivain principal*.²⁹

Because Cazotte had never been completely cured of a fever which he had contracted in Rochefort and because his stay in Sainte Lucie had aggravated this illness, he was granted a leave of six months to return to France.³⁰ On July 25, 1752, he disembarked at Brest.³¹

It is already known that Cazotte wrote two anonymous brochures on music and two ballads which later served as the basis of *Olivier* during his leave in Paris. He also penned at this time another important work, his account of the operations at Martinique, written in the form of a memoir at Fontainebleau on November 2, 1753, in which he outlined the changes necessary to be made concerning the duties confided to the *commisnaire* and to the *contrôleur* of the Iles du Vent. He also took advantage of this opportunity to complain again of his poor salary and of his lack of reimbursement for losses sustained in Martinique.³²

²⁵ *Arch. nat., Colonies C²A 59*

²⁶ *Ibid.*, letter of February 17, 1751

²⁷ *Loc. cit.* Cazotte probably exaggerated the state of his finances. We shall see that he loaned 33,000 livres to Père Lavalette during the year 1751. He may, however, have been authorized to make this loan from the funds of the king.

²⁸ *Loc. cit.*

²⁹ *Ibid.*, letter of May 23, 1751.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, letters of April 13, May 23, and July 15, 1751

³¹ *Ibid.*, letter of July 25, 1752

³² 'Mémoire sur les changements à faire . . .', *Arch. nat., Colonies C²A*

It may have been owing to reasons of health that Cazotte greatly overstayed his leave of six months in Paris. It was only on February 17, 1754 that he returned to Martinique, after having suffered excessively from a rough, twenty-eight day crossing.³³

Cazotte's second encounter with lawless superiors took the form of a struggle against the greed of the governor of Martinique, Rouillé de Raucourt. The two men had originally been good friends and had lived together. Suddenly they grew cold, and Rouillé, wishing to retain the house, which was rented by Cazotte, as well as the furniture which belonged to Cazotte, sent a guard, armed with a gun and bayonette, to eject his former friend from their mutual dwelling. Cazotte was advised by the governor-general, Bompar, to have recourse to justice. An officer, authorized by Bompar and sent by the *procureur-général*, tried to reclaim the furniture, but he was cast into prison, the furniture was confiscated, and the affair ended.³⁴

Cazotte had another encounter with Rouillé during the Seven Years' War. Rouillé, fearing that the English would lay siege to Saint Pierre, bought the entire stock of a merchant named Guis in order not to lack provisions. This purchase was to be paid by the funds of the king. When Guis presented the bill, Cazotte refused to pay it, saying that it would first have to be approved by Bompar.³⁵ The governor immediately flew into a rage. He commanded a detachment of men to arrest Cazotte and even marched at the rear of his troops in order to see that his orders were carried out. During the assault, which lasted three hours, Cazotte was lightly wounded in both hands. The result of the affair was not entirely satisfactory to Cazotte, who wrote.

Le scandale [over the affair] était bien grand dans le public. Le gouvernement général me montra de la sensibilité. On promit qu'on rendrait compte de mon affaire et l'on l'a fait mais on s'est bien gardé de me donner aucune satisfaction vis-à-vis du public. Il ne faut pas détruire une idée qu'on a eu tant de peine à enraciner, c'est qu'il n'y a point ici d'officiers de justice, de police ou de finances, quelqu'élevé qu'il

³³ *Ibid.*, letter of February 17, 1754.

³⁴ *Arch. nat.*, *Colonies* E 66 (Cazotte), letter of August 9, 1756, and *Archives des Affaires étrangères, Amérique*, tome 25 (*Indes occidentales*, tome 22), folios 228-238.

³⁵ Bompar was, at that time, on an expedition planned to help the inhabitants of Guadeloupe during the siege of that island by the English.

soit, qui soit à l'abri d'un coup de main. Ni sa place, ni sa conduite ne doivent l'en garantir, et il est, à cet égard, au droit des simples citoyens qui n'en ont aucun et qui sont sujets au caprice du premier ou du dernier militaire.

Aussi la justice se rend-elle en tremblant ou plutôt, dès qu'il s'agit d'un homme de cet état, on n'en rend point.³⁶

Of even more seriousness to Cazotte than his personal troubles with colonial officials were the vicious accusations of graft and selfishness made against him by his enemies.³⁷ These accusations he has listed in a memoir written directly after his permanent leave to France.³⁸

Probably owing to the strain of his labors, Cazotte again became seriously ill, this time by an attack of scurvy. While translating³⁹ a volume of procedures, written at the order of the king of Spain, concerning the return of fugitive slaves from Spanish to French colonies, this disease affected his eyes, and he became partially blind.⁴⁰ This affliction forced him to return permanently to France sometime between May and November, 1759.⁴¹

4. Cazotte's participation in the Lavalette affair has already been thoroughly investigated. I would like to emphasize, however, the fact that, until he received a final terse, negative response from Ricci, general of the Jesuit Order, in reply to his request that he be given the money owed him, Cazotte never lost his profound faith and trust in the Company of Jesus. When he left Martinique, the Pères Lavalette and Fayard gave him a letter of credit for his twenty negroes, a large quantity of cattle, and some cash. So great was his trust in these fathers that he left the

³⁶ *Arch. des Affaires étrangères*, etc.

³⁷ Cazotte was, in reality, an honest and highly capable officer. His memoir to Choiseul (*loc. cit.*) contains an excellent analysis of France's unstable colonial administration and his remedies for its weaknesses. A concrete example of his ability as an administrator is the fact that he completely equipped a flotilla of twenty vessels in the incredibly short time of four days (see *Mém. à Mgr le duc de Praslin*, etc.).

³⁸ 'Mémoire,' *Arch. de la Marine*, E. 81.

³⁹ The official interpreter did not have the ability to translate the volume.

⁴⁰ *Mém. à Mgr le duc de Praslin*, etc., and *Arch. des Aff. étran.*, etc.

⁴¹ Cazotte's last document written in Martinique is dated April 30, 1759, and, on November 21, 1759, he wrote in Paris his memoir listing the accusations made against him by his enemies.

original letter of credit with Père Fayard and took only a copy with him.⁴² This trust, however, had been supported by other business dealings with the Jesuits. In 1751, he loaned Père Lavallette 33,000 livres who later paid his debt with letters of credit on Paris. These letters were, at that time, quickly honored.⁴³

Only after he found it necessary to sue the Jesuits did Cazotte write his *Mémoire sur les demandes formées contre le Général et la Société des Jésuites*. Shortly thereafter, he withdrew his suit in favor of the Lioncy brothers, who had been forced into bankruptcy by the Company.⁴⁴ It was because the Jesuits had viciously attacked his first memoir that Cazotte believed it necessary to write his *Second Mémoire pour le sieur Cazotte . . . contre le Général et la Société des Jésuites*. This pamphlet was also answered by the Jesuits, who accused Cazotte's defenders of an "insigne fausseté."⁴⁵

5. Pons, in his introduction to an edition of *Le Diable amoureux*,⁴⁶ has pointed out that Cazotte failed in his attempt to obtain a pension from five different ministers of the marine. It was refused because Cazotte, upon his retirement from active service, had chosen to receive the *brevet* of *commissaire général* rather than a pension. Pons did not state, however, that Cazotte refused the pension because it amounted to only 1000 livres, the sum given to an ordinary scribe. He thought that it would be degrading to accept such an offer.⁴⁷

When he returned to Paris, Cazotte's financial distress was such that he was unable to live in Paris, and he decided to buy a small estate in the country with a part of his patrimony.⁴⁸ He was not forced to take this step, however, because his brother died in 1760 and left him a beautiful home in Pierry, a small village near Epernay.⁴⁹

⁴² Cazotte feared that his belongings might again be seized by the English.

⁴³ Rouhette and Target fils, *op cit*, p. 11.

⁴⁴ Rouhette and Target fils, *Second Mémoire pour le sieur Cazotte . . . contre le Général et la Société des Jésuites* (Paris, 1761), p. 4 footnote. This memoir is probably the work of Cazotte.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, p. 111.

⁴⁶ The edition of Quantin, Paris, 1878.

⁴⁷ *Arch. nat.*, *xx*Colomies E. 66 (Cazotte), letter to Sartines.

⁴⁸ See Cazotte's 'Mémoire,' *Arch. de la Marne*, E. 81.

⁴⁹ See extract of the will of the abbé Cazotte, *Arch. de la Marne*, E. 82.

In July, 1761, Cazotte married Elisabeth Roignan⁵⁰ This marriage was the result of a friendship between Cazotte and Rousseau-Simon Roignan, the father of Elisabeth. While Cazotte was working in the department of the marine at Martinique, Roignan served as "conseiller du Roi et son Lieutenant du Fort-Royal de la Martinique."⁵¹ The two men became such close friends that Cazotte, acting for his brother, sold a house in Pierry to Roignan on July 24, 1758⁵²

Although Cazotte, during his long residence in Pierry, devoted much of his time to literature, his fame rests not only upon his accomplishments as a man of letters but also upon his connection with Martinism. I have been unable to find any document which might shed some light upon his relationships with this sect, and it is thus impossible to state precisely the date or the place⁵³ of Cazotte's initiation into the Order. Nevertheless, it is probable that his initiation took place only near the end of his life. His *Diable amoureux* proves that he was interested in occultism as early as 1772, but it does not prove that he was an initiate, since there is nothing in this tale which might not have been gathered from previous cabalistic stories or from old legends. Furthermore, the only tales which are obviously inspired by the teachings of Martinism are his oriental *contes*, published between 1787 and 1789.

This theory is also supported by the fact that Cazotte remained a member of the sect for only three years⁵⁴ because many of his associates joined the Société des Philalèthes, an order which openly supported the revolutionists,⁵⁵ whereas Cazotte himself was staunchly royalistic. Thus, it is probable that he became a Martinist not earlier than 1784 or 1785.

Cazotte's house is, at present, the *mairie* of Pierry. Only the front wall of the building and a summer house to the right of the court have not been restored.

⁵⁰ Bourgeois, in his 'Etude historique sur Cazotte,' *Revue de Champagne*, x (1881), p. 291, has published Cazotte's certificate of marriage.

⁵¹ *Loc. cit.*

⁵² See document of sale, *Arch. de la Marne*, E 87.

⁵³ Cazotte probably received his initiation at the lodge of Lyons. This fact is definitely stated in the *Almanach prophétique*, 1847, p. 127.

⁵⁴ Cazotte, *Oeuvres*, I, cxiv.

⁵⁵ *L'Almanach prophétique*, 1847, p. 128, and Dermenghem, *Joseph de Maistre, mystique* (Paris, 1923), p. 44, footnote 5.

6. Anna-Maria (Mme d'Hautefeuille), in her *Famille Cazotte*,⁵⁶ has left a long and interesting account of the events which took place during the last weeks of Cazotte's life. But, since she has greatly romanticized her account, made an occasional false statement, and erred in the chronological order of the events, I shall briefly state the authentic facts which led to the trial of Cazotte.

Cazotte and his daughter, Elisabeth, were arrested in Pierry at eleven o'clock on the morning of August 18, 1792.⁵⁷ On the afternoon of that day, they were accompanied by officers from Pierry to the jail at Epernay,⁵⁸ from which they were transported to Paris and taken to the Abbaye Saint-Germain-des-Prés. On the 29th of August, Cazotte was questioned at length by Fouquier-Tinville concerning his activities as a royalist.⁵⁹ During the evening of August 30th, he was returned to the Abbaye.⁶⁰ On the afternoon of September 2nd, Maillard and his assassins commenced the September massacres at the Abbaye. Sometime between five o'clock on the afternoon of September 2nd⁶¹ and noon on September 3rd,⁶² Cazotte was brought before Maillard and saved from death by the bravery of his daughter, whose beauty had won the admiration of the Marseillais.⁶³

7. Although Cazotte had been liberated during the September massacres, he was quickly re-arrested and tried on September 24,

⁵⁶ Published by Waille, Paris, 1846.

⁵⁷ *Arch. nat.*, W 242, no 14, doc no 1. Anna-Maria's statement that Elisabeth begged the officers that she be arrested with her father is false. Peltier's account (*Dernier Tableau de Paris* [London, 1794], II, pp 199, 200) of Cazotte's arrest is also pure fiction.

⁵⁸ *Le Cabinet historique*, XXI (1875), first part, p 195. The documents pertaining to Cazotte's arrest, now lost, were originally in the Bibliothèque d'Epernay under the number 208 (90). Fortunately, most of these documents were printed in *Le Cabinet historique*.

⁵⁹ See 'Interrogatoire de Jacques Cazotte,' *ibid.*, 202-224, or *Arch. nat.*, W 242, no 14, doc no 2. On September 1st, Fouquier-Tinville wrote his *note d'accusation*, charging Cazotte with conspiring to bring about a counter-revolution in favor of the king (Cazotte, *op cit.*, I, cvi, cvii).

⁶⁰ Saint-Méard, 'Mon Agonie de trente-huit heures,' *Les Journées de Septembre, 1792* (Paris, 1858), pp 17, 18.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p 21.

⁶² Orse, *Massacres des prisonniers de l'Abbaye* (Paris, 1853), p 142.

⁶³ See Scévole Cazotte, *Les Témoignages d'un royaliste* (Paris, 1839), pp 102, 103.

1792 Desessarts⁶⁴ has written a long and ample account of the trial Called the Marat of royalism by the revolutionists,⁶⁵ he was guillotined at seven o'clock on the evening of September 25th.⁶⁶ Elisabeth was acquitted by the tribunal⁶⁷

E. P. SHAW

University of Illinois

LA PREMIÈRE RÉDACTION DE L'OLLIVIER DE CAZOTTE

Ollivier est un de ces romans chevaleresques et libertins, pour lesquels le XVIIIème siècle montra une préférence si marquée, et qui doivent en grande partie leur esprit à la *Pucelle*, et aux romans de Voltaire. L'ouvrage de Cazotte est un des plus représentatifs de ce genre. Il jouit d'un grand succès à l'époque de son apparition, et il eut plusieurs éditions successives, soit séparément, soit dans la collection des œuvres complètes de l'écrivain. Il est assez intéressant, pour qu'il mérite que l'on s'occupe de lui de plus près, c'est pourquoi il est étonnant qu'un manuscrit qui présente une forme antérieure à celle qui devait être imprimée, soit resté ignoré, dans une des bibliothèques publiques de France.

Ce manuscrit s'intitule *Ollivier. Poème*; s'il n'a jamais été signalé, c'est sans doute parce qu'il ne porte pas de nom d'auteur. Il se compose de deux volumes in-4°, de 311 et 355 pages. Il a fait partie, au XIXème siècle, des collections de Victor Regnault et de M.-J. Garinet, et est passé de cette dernière dans la Bibliothèque de la Ville de Châlons-sur-Marne, où il porte aujourd'hui les cotes 277-278.

Le texte présente une version du roman sensiblement différente de celle que l'on rencontre dans les éditions imprimées, et qui ne fut pas sans souffrir elle-même, d'une édition à l'autre, certaines modifications. Le manuscrit n'est pas autographe, mais il porte un certain nombre de corrections, et des indications marginales en

⁶⁴ Desessarts, *Procès fameux jugés depuis la Révolution* (Paris, an 7), II, 203-239.

⁶⁵ *Le Patriote français*, issue of September 26, 1792.

⁶⁶ *Le Courrier français*, issue of September 26, 1792, no. 270, p. 8.

⁶⁷ *Arch nat*, W 242, no. 14, doc. no. 8

regard des endroits sujets à des modifications, et il semble certain que ces corrections sont de la main de Cazotte. Elles rapprochent toutes le texte de l'*Ollivier* manuscrit de celui des éditions imprimées, ce sont donc surtout les fragments auxquels elles se rapportent qui nous intéressent ici, car ils représentent la première pensée de l'écrivain, et montrent par quelles voies son inspiration a trouvé une forme définitive.

Dans le manuscrit, le roman se compose de XX chants, divisés en quatre livres, on sait que dans les éditions imprimées, la matière a été divisée en XII chants seulement. Chaque chapitre est précédé, dans le manuscrit, d'un exorde dans le goût de ceux par lesquels l'Arioste avait fait commencer les chants du *Roland Furieux*, et que Voltaire avait imités dans la *Pucelle*. Mais plus tard, Cazotte ne les trouva sans doute plus à son goût, car un coup de crayon en marge des premiers chants, et des indications de la main de l'auteur en tête des suivants,¹ montrent son intention de les écarter de la rédaction définitive.

En fait, le roman imprimé ne contient aucun exorde, pas même au commencement, qui est assez brusque, et qui conduit dès la première ligne au beau milieu de ces aventures. Il y avait, cependant, une bien longue introduction dans la première rédaction de l'ouvrage. Elle a été complètement laissée de côté, nous en reproduisons ici une partie, pour montrer d'abord dans quel goût l'auteur se préparait à écrire, et ensuite qu'il n'a pas mal fait d'éliminer ce passage, qui ne contient que trop de déclamations et d'amorces :

Ah, si j'avois la voix légère, agréable et sonore ! si mon archet moelleux sçavoit tirer de ma lyre ces sons touchans qui pénètrent le cœur ! je chanterois les graces et l'amour alors, alors, j'élèverois ma tête couronnée de myrthes entre les cignes qui font l'honneur de ce rivage. Je verrois le chœur des nymphes s'empreser de fendre les flots pour venir m'environner, m'agacer et me sourire, et peut-être le duvet éclatant et poli de mon col d'albâtre se verroit caressé par plus d'une Leda aux doigts de roze. . .

Je vais vous en conter sur tous les tons. Jamais vous n'en aurez autant appris de vos complaisantes nourrices. Entraînez-les avec vous ; qu'elles apprennent de moi des histoires. L'hiver va vous rassembler bientôt autour de vos foyers, alors elles vous les réciteront au son enroué de leurs rouets, et je vous vois d'ici, la bouche beante et le cœur saisi, vous pendre à leurs ceintures et devorer leurs paroles .

¹ "Prologue à retrancher," ch VI, vol I, p 157 "Prologue à ôter, le remplacer par la description de la mort de Gonoran, gendre du Soudan," ch IX, vol I, p. 247 "Prologue à retrancher," ch XI, vol II, p 158.

Tous les autres exordes sont dans le même goût. Au IIème chant, où Inare, personnage antipathique, est tombé dans une trappe, l'auteur montre son contentement devant la mésaventure d'un héros qu'il n'aime pas

Que le brutal Inare resteroit bien sous terre, si j'étois le maître d'altérer les faits' Je lui eusse au moins rompu le col, de façon qu'on ne pût jamais le lui remettre que de travers Mais il faudrait bien le tirer de là, et tout ce que je puis faire pour le service de ma petite passion particulière contre ce brutal, c'est de l'oublier quelque temps dans sa fosse, pour courir à des héros bien plus intéressans pour moi (I, 47)

Au IIIème chant, ses réflexions sont d'un caractère aussi personnel

Les gens qui ne croient point, ne sont point mes gens Le doute qui les fait flotter les inquiète et leur corrompt l'humeur, leur caractère m'est suspect, et j'ai peu d'opinion de leur esprit (I, 61)

Tout cela est bien près de l'Arioste et de Voltaire, nous nous rapprochons davantage du premier, avec l'exode guerrier du IVème chant "Le son éclatant des trompettes et des clairons me réveille. . . O, vous, soutien de mon entreprise, chroniqueur exact et véridique, digne continuateur de Turpin, révélez-moi des faits mal rendus par l'infidèle Renommée, et que l'histoire a mal à propos dédaignés." (I, 93-5.) Celui du chant V est une allusion directe au texte du *Roland Furieux* "On dit que les gens qui vont au loin voient des choses bien extraordinaires. Il faut que je sois bien malheureux, moi qui y ai été, et qui n'ai rien vu." (I, 123.)²

L'Arioste, et après lui Voltaire, avaient aussi introduit, à la fin de chacun de leurs chants, des conclusions personnelles, qui sont imitées dans la première rédaction de *Ollivier*, et qui ont été abandonnées par la suite Comme toutes ces conclusions se ressemblent, nous nous contenterons de reproduire celle du premier chant.

Mais j'entrevois des nuages sur la physionomie de mon auditoire Ah, les pauvres enfans! les aurois-je attristés? Je m'aperçois que j'ai broié trop de noir, et que le cothurne que j'ai chaussé pourroit bien être trop large pour ma jambe, resserrons-en les courroies, baissions de ton, ména-

² Cf Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, VII, 1

Chi va lontan dalla sua patria, vede
Cose da quel che già credea, lontane.

geons-nous, songeons que la carrière est longue, et que nous n'avons pour tout équipage qu'une vielle et quelques chansons (I, 32)

La manière de raconter est aussi imitée de l'Arioste. Ollivier n'est pas le seul héros du roman, à côté de lui, un certain nombre d'autres personnages, des guerriers aussi bien que des amoureuses, jouent des rôles au moins aussi importants que le sien. Leurs aventures sont racontées à bâtons rompus, dans un désordre qui voudrait reproduire la nonchalance du conteur italien, et rattachées uniquement par le fil frêle de quelque plaisanterie: "J'allois revenir deux fois par la même route," dit l'auteur, "séduit par le plaisir que je trouve à parler d'Ollivier. Mais le temps me presse, j'ai un tissu à former, des fils à tendre, et plus d'une navette à mettre en jeu. Voions ce qu'aura fait Enguerrand, depuis qu'Inare s'est séparé de lui" (I, 57-8.) "Il faut m'éloigner pour quelque temps," écrit-il une autre fois, "des plaines de Syrie, et retourner vers les campagnes de la Touraine" (I, 108-9) Ailleurs, il annonce de la même manière le changement de son inspiration "J'altererois ma constitution, si je m'occupois plus longtemps à peindre des tableaux héroïques. Il faut ménager mes poumons, qui souffrent de l'effort que je fais pour grossir le son de ma voix. Passons à des événements que je sois à portée de décrire sans faire violence à la nature." (I, 194)

Dans la dernière rédaction, celle qui devait être imprimée, la plupart de ces parenthèses ont été supprimées, grâce au fait que l'écrivain a changé complètement de plan, dans le sens d'une ordonnance plus stricte et plus logique de son récit. Ses aventures ne sont plus aussi morcelées qu'il avait voulu les présenter d'abord, plusieurs fragments sont réunis autour du même noyau, et le tissu des histoires en apparaît plus simple et plus facilement intelligible.

Les corrections apportées au texte regardent, le plus souvent, le style et les expressions. D'autres fois, il abrège les phrases qui traînent, il remplace un mot qui ne sonne pas bien, il arrondit une image.

Tout cela montre des préoccupations d'ordre et d'élégance, qui ne sont pas sans intérêt. Mais cela prouve en même temps que l'ouvrage de Cazotte fut conçu comme une imitation de l'Arioste et de Voltaire,³ et que ce ne fut que plus tard que l'auteur dégagea

³ Dans la première conception de l'auteur, il avait été un conte badin, dans le genre de ceux de La Fontaine, cf l'article de Gérard de Nerval sur Cazotte, publié avec plusieurs éditions modernes du *Diable amoureux*

son inspiration de l'imitation trop serrée de ces deux modèles, en écartant systématiquement tout ce qui lui semblait les rappeler. Il eut tellement à cœur de séparer ses imaginations des fantaisies de l'Arioste, qu'il en prévint ses lecteurs dans sa préface même, en déclarant qu'il ne se l'était pas proposé comme modèle, mais, malgré ces mesures tardives, l'imitation de l'Arioste n'en est pas moins évidente, dans l'esprit de l'ouvrage comme dans la qualité de sa fantaisie.

AL. CIORANESCU

Fontenay-aux-Roses

BÉRANGER'S NEGLECTED POEM TO MANUEL

It was not until twenty-one years after the death of Jacques-Antoine Manuel (1775-1827) that Béranger wrote the last of a series of *chansons* dedicated to his friend and fellow patriot. This final poem, under the title *A Manuel*, has consistently escaped the attention of Béranger's editors. Despite its lack of exceptional merit, it is a significant expression of the poet's feelings at the close of an epoch, and rightly deserves a place in future editions of Béranger's works.

Although Béranger was on excellent terms with Thiers, Mignet, and other prominent men, he valued no friend more than the young Manuel. Both shared the same political interests, both felt an intense solicitude for the liberty and happiness of France. The poems addressed to Manuel show the poet in his best vein (cf. *Les Esclaves Gaulois*, *Le Convoy de Manuel*, *Le Tombeau de Manuel*).¹

No French collection contains Béranger's poem *A Manuel*, written on the advent of the Second Republic in February 1848. Outside of a Bibliothèque Nationale reprint,² William Young's vol-

¹ Cf. also *Ma Biographie, écrite par Béranger* [Paris, 1860], p. 197, *Œuvres complètes* [Paris, 1858], II, 214-15, E de Mirecourt, *Béranger* [Les Contemporains, Paris, 1856], II, 65, 80, S. LaPointe, *Mémoires sur Béranger* [Paris, 1857], ch. xv, J. L. Dubreton, *Béranger, la Chanson, la Politique* [Paris, 1934], pp. 68-70, 103-105.

² See leaflet in the Bibliothèque Nationale entitled *Stances de Béranger aux mânes de Manuel* (sic), *sur la révolution de février 1848*, Paris, imprimerie de Schneider, 1848, in-8°, 4 pp. Obviously a reprint of only the verses from *Le Travail*, the poem is dated as of March 10, 1848.

ume³ alone includes it, but here we have merely an English translation, not the original poem, animated with the patriotic fervor of Béranger. It is strange that these verses should be overlooked by Béranger's publisher Perrotin. *A Manuel* appears in *Le Travail* (February 24, 1848), an ephemeral journal published at Paris by Edouard Houel. The journal may be consulted in the important collection of miscellaneous French newspapers (1848-1850) available at the Virginia State Library in Richmond. Like many other short-lived publications of that era, this "carré de papier" sustained itself on the patriotic rhapsodizings of contemporary versifiers.

In this particular issue, *Le Travail* outdoes itself in tribute to Béranger ("L'univers entier répète son nom avec enthousiasme à l'égal de PEUPLE FRANÇAIS"), and devotes a long introduction to *A Manuel*. It would be pointless to reproduce such encomium in full, but, as typical of the lack of discrimination common to all these propaganda sheets, the following excerpts bearing directly on our poem are of interest:

Nous reproduisons avec enthousiasme la plus récente, la plus actuelle des poésies de notre chansonnier populaire Béranger, le poète des GUEUX, le CHASSEUR DE ROIS. Les pensées larges et généreuses qui fécondent de leur lumière ce nouveau chef-d'œuvre, l'émotion que nous a inspirée leur lecture, l'exemple de ce vieillard à l'âme ardente et jeune, rappelleront aux incrédules rétifs et impuissans qu'il existe un homme immortel auquel les BÂCLEURS de théories, les racoleurs de consciences refusent une influence politique. Les ingrats!

A Manuel embodies the two motifs of patriotic thanksgiving and of personal tribute. As the poet's victory-song written for a country freed from oppression, these lines may be considered a happy sequel to *Les Enfants de la France* in which Béranger, twenty-nine years earlier, had prophesied France's ultimate triumph over her reverses. Young,⁴ in a note on the poem, points out the irony of Béranger's premature rejoicing. "Could the poet have foreseen what lame conclusions were to follow the event he here commemorates, he would scarcely thus have evoked the spirit of his dear friend Manuel, who appears to have been his *beau idéal* of a politician and a man."

³ Béranger—*Two Hundred of his Lyrical Poems done into English Verse*, by William Young (New York, 1850), pp. 360-61.

⁴ *Loc cit*, p. 360.

A MANUEL

(Air de la bonne vieille)

O Manuel, la France s'est levée¹
 Sa liberté n'a plus un ennemi
 C'est bien ainsi que nous l'avions rêvée¹
 Peuple géant qui n'est rien à demi¹
 Puisqu'il nous mène à la terre promise,
 Dieu parmi nous aurait dû te laisser
 Qu'avais-tu fait pour mourir en Moïse?
 Mon pauvre ami, je voudrais t'embrasser

Sortant vainqueur de ces luttes sublimes,
 Tu penserais à mon tout petit coin
 C'est dans ces jours de fièvres magnanimes,
 Que l'un de l'autre on a souvent² besoin
 Longtemps muets, dans une étreinte antique,
 Puis, refoulant nos pleurs dans un baiser,
 Nous nous disions² Vive la République¹
 Mon pauvre ami, je voudrais t'embrasser

Le sait-on bien? Depuis qu'au Jeu de Paume
 S'ouvrit l'époque où le peuple vainqueur,
 Fit affluer en notre beau royaume
 Le monde entier, comme le sang au cœur
 Du livre d'or sanglant, sublime ou sage,
 Où chaque lustre eut sa gloire à tracer,
 Quarante-huit est la plus belle page¹
 Mon pauvre ami, je voudrais t'embrasser

La royauté stérilisait l'empire,
 Et jetait l'ancre en ce sable mouvant,
 Le foudre passe, et le trône chavire,
 Et j'ai cherché sa trace vainement
 Mais je retrouve une France féconde,
 Qu'un noble sang vient de fertiliser,
 Sol généreux, qui nourrira le monde¹
 Mon pauvre ami, je voudrais t'embrasser

La République est grande et sera stable,
 Elle remplit nos vœux, mais je t'aimais,
 Je me souviens de ce cri lamentable.
 Plaignons les morts, ils dorment à jamais¹

¹ The Schneider leaflet (cf *supra*, note 2) reads *surtout* for *souvent*

² *Crirons* replaces *nous disions* in the Schneider leaflet. There is no evidence that this change or the one in the preceding note are due to Béranger

Dormir, hélas! quand la France se lève,
 Lorsque, pour vaincre, et pour se surpasser,
 Elle a besoin de l'esprit et du glaive!
 Mon pauvre ami, je voudrais t'embrasser

 Gloire à toi, peuple, à tes succès rapides!
 Je t'aime mieux lorsque je pense à lui,
 Mes bras ouverts ne resteront pas vides,
 Tous les Français sont frères aujourd'hui
 Vieillard courbé, quand tu courais aux armes,
 Comme les morts, j'ai dû me reposer,
 Mon sang est froid, mais j'ai de chaudes larmes,
 Peuple français, je voudrais t'embrasser

The long neglect of this *chanson*, together with its content, may serve as a reminder that a detailed study of the friendship between the two patriots is a meritorious topic which still awaits the attention of historians of nineteenth-century French literature. The salvaging of *A Manuel* from dusty heaps of journalistic inedita is accordingly an essential beginning.

JOHN G. ROBERTS

Lehigh University

SOME REMARKS REGARDING A TEXTUAL CHANGE IN GOETHE'S "HEIDENROSLEIN"

"Röslein wehrte sich und stach,
 Half ihm [ihr] doch kein Weh und Ach, "

There is no doubt that the "ihm," which replaces the earlier "ihr" in C¹, C, and W, was a change intended by Goethe himself. "Röslein" is grammatically a neuter noun, and the neuter pronoun is, therefore, the correct one. Besides, the new version occurs for the first time in the C¹ edition, and, according to G. L. Rogers, all textual changes in this edition over against B are "either the correction of misprints or new versions introduced by Goethe himself."¹ One question only remains from the text-critical point of view: whereas the "ihm" occurs in C¹, is carried over to C, and was naturally accepted in the Weimar edition as the final and

¹ G. L. Rogers, *Zur Textgeschichte der Gedichte Goethes*, a doctor's dissertation submitted in manuscript form to The Johns Hopkins University, 1938, p. 57, my quotation is translated from the original German.

authentic text, C², which is a re-print of C¹, returns to the earlier "ihr" A study of Table XVIII in G. L. Rogers' dissertation reveals that there is not one other such case where C² has the same text as B and B¹, as contrasted with C and C¹ Of course, it may merely be a misprint, introduced by the type-setter The Weimar edition seems to ignore that fact altogether in its apparatus and merely states the following "ihm] ihr S-B."

Now, while "ihm" is more correct grammatically, it may lead to a possible confusion in meaning We all know Goethe wanted to say that the "Roslein" (really a symbol for the maiden), has to suffer through the boy's impetuosity, and that neither its sting nor its lament can save it The context makes that appear as the most natural interpretation. It is also the most likely one, because of the association between this poem and the Friederike episode in Goethe's life Nevertheless, misinterpretations have been made. "Ihm" could be masculine as well as neuter, and in that case it would refer to the boy. Such an interpretation would derive its justification from the fact that the feminine pronoun, often used colloquially for the neuter "Madchen," might be expected in a poem which is so decidedly like a folk-song in character The use of "ihm," therefore, might suggest the masculine rather than the neuter gender.

The present writer's interest was attracted to this question by the Theo. Baker translation of the poem as it appears in the Schirmer edition of Schubert's songs The manuscript of Schubert's "Heidenroslein" bears the date of August 19, 1815² As the very latest editions of Goethe's works then in existence were the E² and B-editions (Cotta, 1815), Schubert naturally wrote "Half ihr doch kein Weh und Ach" The German versions of the song have retained that text I had sung it for many years, and there had been no doubt whatsoever in my mind about its meaning. I was, therefore, rather startled when I wanted to sing the song in English one day and found the following translation of these lines "Vainly he laments his woes, With pain his hand is glowing,"³ which made me wonder for the first time whether it was the boy or the girl who had to take the punishment. Theo. Baker evidently

² In Betz-Price, *Learning German*, American Book Co, there is a facsimile of this manuscript on p 481

³ *Schubert's Songs*, Schirmer, v I, p 229

used a more modern text than that of the Schubert song and had misunderstood it. Most other translations, however, clearly agree with the generally accepted interpretation. It is interesting to note that of a number of American college students to whom this poem was assigned, very many made the same mistake as Theo Baker, unless they were warned. It might also be added that all modern American school texts use the wording found in the Weimar edition. The latest one still to use the "ihr" is Klara H. Collitz', *Selections from Classical German Literature*, published by the Oxford University Press in 1914.

F. ILMER

Hollins College

THE RUIN

The poem usually called "The Ruin" is to be found on f. 124 of the Exeter Book, except for its first seven words which form the last line of the preceeding folio. The last twelve pages of this codex have been mutilated by fire, apparently by a brand which fell upon the book when it was face down, destroying many lines of the text. About one quarter of the poem here considered is thus irrevocably lost, what remains is excessively puzzling. The fragment abounds in hapax legomena, scribal errors and ambiguities. The poem itself is a ruin.

The difficulty of translation makes no less difficult the problem of what the poet was talking about. Various writers (Conybeare, Leo, Earle, Wul(c)ker) have considered that it refers to a town, others (Ettmuller, Grein, Sweet) to a fortress. Leo and Earle independently arrived at the idea that the subject of the poem is Bath. No other definite locality seems to have been proposed, the most recent editor of the poem (Dobbie) adds: ". and perhaps none need be sought". There are, however, possibilities as yet uncanvassed which seem to the present writer not only to fulfil the apparent requirements of the poem but to do so better than Bath. I propose the Roman Wall.

The identification with Bath rests largely upon the supposition that no other locality in Britain possesses the characteristics described in the poem. These consist principally in impressive

masonry, defensive fortification, dilapidated ancient splendor and hot baths. As a matter of fact, several localities might be suggested, though none so outstandingly appropriate as Hadrian's wall and the associated complex of Roman settlements, Corstopitum, Chesters, Housesteads and the like. That these structures profoundly impressed the Anglo-Saxon observer may be noted in the description of the works by Bede.

Miss Kershaw continues an old tradition. "The references to *baðu* . . . *hat* l. xxx f. can hardly refer to any artificial system of heating like the hypocausts used by the Romans, for these would have been unrecognizable. On the other hand, so far as I am aware, there is no evidence of extensive Roman buildings at any of the hot springs in this country except at Bath." I, for one, am unconvinced that the poem refers to hot springs at all and have no evidence that an Anglo-Saxon would not have recognized a hypocaust. He could scarcely have missed the function of the caldarium at Chesters with its boiler and flues.

The first twenty-five lines are appropriate to Hadrian's wall and contain allusions to a multitude of towers, many bathing halls, pinacles and banqueting halls which suggest to the present writer various localities on or near the wall, collectively considered. Lines 19 and 20 (*[h]ygerof gebond / weallwalan wirum wundrum togaedre*) which are rather puzzling at first glance, refer to a type of Roman construction illustrated by the bridge at Chollerford where the stones were bound together by long iron rods set in lead. There are baths at Newcastle, Benwell, Rudchester, Halton Chesters, Chesterholm, Chesters, Burgh-by-Sands, and towers at intervals of usually not more than a mile. For the warriors' treasure which 1.35 suggests that they gazed upon, one might infer that it was rather plentifully distributed along the whole complex from the treasure of coin and precious objects which have awaited the modern observer at sites like Benwell (strong-room plastered and colored), Mile-castles 12 and 13, Chesters (strong-room with iron-studded oak door), Carrawburgh, Housesteads, Chesterholm, Corstopitum, Birdoswald. There must have been a great deal more, say, a thousand years ago.

It is debatable what the poet meant by *wrgsteal* in line 27. If it meant fortification nothing more need be said; the whole affair is a *wrgsteal*. If, however, it means a place of pagan worship (cf.

wih, weoh, wígle, wíghlan, wíglung, weohsteall, wígwiorðung, etc.) it might be pointed out that there is a mithraeum at Housesteads, other cult-relics at Rudchester, altars of various kinds are, or were, at Wallsend, Mile-castles 3, 52, 60, Benwell (temple), Halton, Chesters, Carrawburgh, Castlesteads (several), Kirksteads, Burgh-by Sands, Port Carlisle, Browness-on-Solway

The question of the hot baths is left. Lines 38 to 41 (*stan-hofu* to *hyðelc*) would do for any Roman bath. Lines 42, 43 (*leton ðonne geotan ofer hárne stan hâte streamas*) and the fragmentary remains of the lines which follow would apply perfectly to the situation at Great Chesters, if *leton* is taken as causative. There and at Halton Chesters were aqueducts, the former was six miles long. *Leton*, indeed! The lines "*stanhofu stodan stream hâte wearp wíðan weal eall befeng*" do not say that the water was hot as it issued from the earth. They may more justly be taken to mean that the heated water was run copiously into the baths.

Briefly, then, the wall and adjacent structures fulfil every requirement of the poem. There is no reason why a Northumbrian poet should not have heard of Bath and memorialized it in his poem, but as one who has often visited both sites, I cannot feel otherwise than that he was writing about the nearer and infinitely more impressive ruin.

STEPHEN J HERBEN

Bryn Mawr College

REVIEWS

Letters of Ludwig Tieck. Hitherto Unpublished 1792-1853. Collected and edited by EDWIN H ZEYDEL, PERCY MATENKO, and ROBERT HERNDON FIFE, with the co-operation of the Department of Germanic Languages, Columbia University. (New York: Modern Language Association of America, London: Oxford University Press, 1937).

This volume, containing 487 letters, 467 of these by Tieck, here printed for the first time, makes a very noteworthy addition to the documentary material about Tieck now available to the scholar. To give full credit to the editors and their collaborators in the German Seminar of Columbia University for the zeal that led to

the assembling, arranging, and annotating of this formidable mass of material, one would have to restate in detail the numerous difficulties that beset the editors at every stage of their labors. A fair idea of the amount of work that has gone into the making of this volume can be gleaned from a look at the preface and the analytical table of contents.

It was not the intention of the editors to produce a book that would be read from cover to cover (except by a reviewer). A sizable armful of other volumes, published or in preparation, have preempted the more readable items of Tieck's correspondence. This volume assembles between its covers a miscellany consisting largely of business correspondence and including the unpublished portions of letters which have already appeared elsewhere in part. With the aim of ultimately laying before the scholar as complete a record as possible of Tieck's correspondence the editors have spared no pains to give this volume the character of a practical reference work to be used in conjunction with the whole arsenal of Tieck correspondence. This end is served by the analytical table of contents, the index of names and places filling 24 double column pages, the elaborate and necessarily often repetitive set of notes prefacing each letter, and the informative summaries tracing the course of Tieck's relations with some of the more prominently represented correspondents, such as the publishers Reimer, Max, and Cotta. It is doubtless practical considerations, too, that led to the grouping of these letters—a compromise between systematic and chronological arrangement.

Although prepared with great care, the editorial comment cannot help betraying the fact that this publication owes its appearance to cooperative effort. The quality of the notes is uneven, some of them tend to smother the reader in a mass of irrelevant detail, while important matters are sometimes glossed over in silence. The English is barbarous in spots. As to the text of the letters, a good many slips and questionable readings seem to have escaped the proof-reader's eye. A few examples will bear out these observations.

The first page of the preface gives concise bibliographical information concerning the publication of Tieck's correspondence with Goethe, Wackenroder, the Schlegels, etc. In this connection there is an irritating mix-up concerning Friedrich von Raumer. We are told that "E. H. Zeydel and Percy Matenko have published the portions of the letters to Friedrich von Raumer which Tieck['] omitted from his edition" (vii). Taken in connection with the earlier statement that Tieck himself had planned to publish selections from his correspondence this misstatement may prove troublesome. If, after following a number of false leads suggested by the context, one consults the aforementioned Zeydel-Matenko publication one discovers that Raumer's *Lebenserinnerungen und Briefwechsel* contained part of the correspondence and his *Literarischer*

Nachlaß the remainder. The substitution of Tieck's name for Raumer's has carried in its wake the unfortunate omission of both these important titles from the bibliographical data of the preface.—I consider it misleading to have the fourth letter of Chapter I listed as To His Father merely because on its face it bore instructions "An den Herrn Tieck abzugeben" (7). In this letter Tieck is obviously talking to his sister. Not a single phrase of that letter is addressed to his sister and to his father jointly. The superscription simply concedes the father's practice of supervising his daughter's correspondence. In a similar way one questions the inclusion of the letter To Alma (92 f) among the family letters, when the editors themselves admit that Tieck's wife cannot have been the recipient and that it is probably a fragment of a projected novel rather than a letter. A fuller note on this mysterious missive would have been desirable.—When Frommann writes about Tieck's brother, the sculptor, "Er hat eine kostliche, sehr ähnliche Buste von Gothe geliefert und der Schlegel eine sehr brave, auch frappant ähnliche, große Zeichnung von Schelling" (35), the comment on this passage contains the following remark "His bust of 'die Schlegel' (i.e. Caroline) is not known, but he made one of Caroline's deceased daughter Auguste in 1804" (31). This nonsensical reading of the above text leads one to suspect that the member of the Seminar who prepared this letter was unaware of the close ties existing between Caroline and Schelling. It is strange that this blunder escaped the editors' attention.—In writing to Reimer about the fifth edition of *Novalis' Schriften* which he is preparing, Tieck writes "Was den *Novalis* betrifft, so erfreut mich Ihr Plan, und ich wünsche ein Vorwort hinzuzufügen. Der unnutze Aufsatz, der durch Frd. Schlegel und Carl Hardenberg hineinkam, muß wieder ausgemerzt werden" (349). Students of Novalis know, of course, that this is a reference to the famous essay *Die Christenheit oder Europa*. The notes to this letter, however, are completely silent on the subject!—There is the curious failure to correlate Schulze's letter of Sep 18, 1841 (452-4) with the letter next in order by Tieck, Sep. 29, 1841 (455), which is obviously Tieck's answer to Schulze. Yet Tieck's letter is prefaced by the remark "Neither the addressee nor the review . . . could be determined" (455). This, purely mechanical, error probably resulted from the note to Tieck's letter being written before the Schulze letter came into possession of the editors. The proof-reader, however, missed a golden opportunity to use his wits.—The mention of a proper name is frequently the cue for releasing a veritable flood of information. Thus when Tieck wants to buy a piano and asks his addressee to consult Breitkopf on the subject we are presented with a four line note on the well-known firm of Breitkopf and Hartel including five dates bearing on the history of the firm and its founder (154). I could cite other cases where erudition is put

to even more trivial uses. Conversely, however, when Tieck alludes to "Thien Propheten Ad Muller" (145) this important writer and proselyte is not deemed worthy of a biographical note. There is only the terse comment "For Johann Adam Muller, cf. Holtei I, 134" (144). A few pages later, the notes again mention Adam Muller in passing (149), and as is to be expected the index gives separate listings for Johann Adam Muller and Adam Muller, as though they were two different persons.—Sometimes a note is inserted in the wrong place. In his letter to Reimer of Jan. 1, 1845 Tieck does not complain of misprints in the *Schriften*, as the notes would have us believe (493), although he does so repeatedly in other letters. On the next page, incidentally, reference is made to Tieck's claim "that the typography of the *Schriften* leaves much to be desired," which is certainly a misleading way of saying that Tieck complains of misprints.

In conclusion I wish to point out some of the more serious misprints in the text of the letters that I happened to observe. In many of these cases it is impossible to determine whether Tieck's text is faultily transcribed or whether the editors simply failed to call attention to a fault in the text as is their custom. P. 6, lines 34 and 36, *ihre*, read *Ihre*. P. 10, line 4, *mich*, read *bist*. P. 35, line 3, die *verzagende* Erscheinung der Fortsetzung, read *verzögerte*. Ibid., line 6, *als*, read *also*. Ibid., line 34, So meint er auch der Mortimer wäre ohne Ihren Golo erst da [sic?]. There is no note to indicate that this refers to Mortimer in Schiller's *Maria Stuart*. P. 36, line 25, *zu abspannen* [sic?]. P. 37, line 17, 27 Bogen, read 72 Bogen. P. 52, line 17, *sie*, read *Sie*. P. 92, line 1, *Sie*, read *sie*. P. 95, line 34, *Ihnen*, read *ihnen*. P. 102, line 12, *Vertrieb*, read *Vertrauen*. P. 105, lines 36 and 38, *sie*, read *Sie*. P. 128, line 15, *Er Wohlgebohrt*, read *Er Wohlgebohrt* [bereit?]. P. 374, line 4, *vortrug*, read *vertrag*. P. 376, line 3, *Christiansol*, read *Christiansoe*. P. 451, lines 23-4, *konnte ich doch niemals die arg hafte Absicht sein*, [sic?].

HERMANN J. WEIGAND

Yale University

Charles Timothy Brooks, *Translator from the German, and the Genteel Tradition*. By CAMILLO VON KLENZE. Boston D. C. Heath & Co., London Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. VII, 114.

Students of the cultural relations between Germany and the United States have long been aware that Charles T. Brooks was a most prolific translator from the German, as well as a significant figure in American intellectual life of the nineteenth century. A

thorough study, however, of Brooks as a German scholar has been neglected, and therefore the present publication is a welcome contribution.

Mr. von Klenze, who has carefully collected his materials from numerous sources, including manuscripts, gives a detailed analysis of Brooks' devotion to German literature. This devotion began when Brooks, as a Harvard undergraduate, was inspired by Carl Follen to study the German language, and extended throughout his long career. The first part of the investigation deals with matter more or less familiar—the interpretation of Germany and her literature by various countries, notably France and England. We are told that Madame de Stael's views, many of which were shared by Follen, and those of Carlyle, found response in the characteristic American attitude of the period of Longfellow and Brooks, deeply influencing the tendency of the genteel tradition. Here, as abroad, there was great admiration for Schiller, though it is significant that Jean Paul Richter should achieve for a time considerable popularity in New England, where Brooks, encouraged by Carlyle, became his most important spokesman.

The author then turns to the major part of his investigation—the treatment of Brooks' numerous translations, admirably supporting his discussion by a characterization of the German originals and by illustrations from the various renditions. Furthermore, we are shown, by Brooks' choice of subjects, the affinity between the translator's interpretation and that of others of the century to which he belonged. The story is complete, beginning in the year 1838, when Brooks presented as the first of his larger undertakings a fairly adequate version of *Wilhelm Tell*, which served to increase American interest in Schiller and in a popular subject. A translation of Schiller's *Homage of the Arts* followed in 1846, and ten years later appeared the version of *Faust I*, a task, we are informed, for which Brooks lacked both mastery of the German idiom and a genuine poetic gift. His efforts, however, are frequently not inferior to those of his more successful rival Bayard Taylor, whose *Faust* was destined to overshadow the work of his predecessor. Nevertheless, we agree with the author's assignment of Brooks' version to a position of importance in the development of American interest in Germany's intellectual life. It was unfortunate that he did not translate the whole of Part Two of the drama.

From Schiller and Goethe, Brooks turned his attention to Jean Paul, a writer, we note, akin in many respects to his translator, and one whom Brooks had previously praised in a paper contributed to the *Christian Examiner*. After *Faust*, the most ambitious effort was a version of *Titan* in 1862, which Hedge pronounced "one of the heroisms of literature" and a credit to American scholarship. There were further translations of Jean Paul's works, including *Hesperus* and *Die unsichtbare Loge*, thus furnishing additional

evidence of Brooks' devotion to a writer whom he erroneously regarded so important to the progress of American culture. Through the years he produced renditions of the whole or part of writings of various other Germans: Auerbach, Schefer, Busch, Koitum, and Ruckert, whose *Wisdom of the Brahmin* (the first six books) appeared in 1882. All of these were difficult tasks, on the whole laudably performed, and were works which appealed to the spirit of the time in New England.

But the most characteristic expression of Brooks' attitude toward German culture is seen in his translations of numerous lyrics and ballads, to which he gave more attention than did any other American of his day. Three collections, supplemented by contributions to some of the leading periodicals and newspapers, appeared between 1842 and 1853. The first, contributed to Ripley's *Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature*, gives greater prominence to Uhland and Korner, the particular selections revealing characteristics congenial to the America of Longfellow, Whittier, and Bryant. It is noteworthy that, excepting a few poems by Burger and Goethe, the classical period is totally neglected. The second collection, which was attached to his translation of Schiller's *Homage of the Arts*, manifests essentially the same temper as the first, though the inclusion of Ruckert, Freiligrath, and Herwegh, shows Brooks' endeavor to convey the spirit of the younger generation. He expresses his appreciation of the new Germany, as expounded by Taillandier, the influential French interpreter of German life. This spirit is further emphasized in the third collection, where Anastasius Grün is assigned a prominent place.

The reader of this study is impressed throughout with Brooks' skill as a translator, despite many obvious defects and the time and energy which he devoted to relatively unimportant works in prose and verse. It is clear, however, as pointed out in the author's admirable summary, that Brooks, child of the genteel tradition, belonged to a period of uncertain literary standards, which explains his lack of discrimination in the choice of subjects. But notwithstanding all this, we may further agree with the opinion that, by his consistent interpretation of the literature of Germany, Brooks greatly enriched the cultural life of our nation.

Mr. von Klenze adds copious and informing notes, a list of Brooks' unpublished works, and a number of unpublished letters found in the manuscripts at Newport. The method of presentation and the conclusions give evidence of the work of a thorough scholar who has for many years rendered valuable service to American learning.

O. W. LONG

Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der Dichtung in Österreich-Ungarn Unter Mitwirkung hervorragender Fachgenossen nach dem Tode von J. W. Nagl und J. Zeidler herausgegeben von EDUARD CASTLE. Dritter Band, 9.-15 Abteilung (S 1273-2388). Wien Carl Fromme, 1936-37

Geschichte der deutschen Literatur Von PROF. DR. TH. C. VAN STOCKUM (Groningen) und PROF. DR. J. VAN DAM (Amsterdam). Zweiter Band Vom 18. Jh. bis zur Gegenwart. Groningen J. B. Wolters, 1935. VIII + 340 S

Deutsche Literaturkunde Erbgut und Erfüllung. Von DR. JOSEF PRESTEL Freiburg i Br Herder und Co (Herder Book Co., St Louis, Mo), 1935. 220 S \$1 15

Von deutscher Dichtung Ein Jugend- und Volksbuch. Von WILHELM VOGELPOHL Leipzig Teubner, 1937 Zweite Auflage, VIII + 243 S Mk 1,95

Es ist ein Glück, daß die Österreichische Literaturgeschichte vollendet wurde, ehe noch die ode Gleichschalterei ihre geisttötende Hand an das Bild dieser ungeheuer verwickelten, durch Rasse, Religion, Staatszugehörigkeit komplizierten, durch Sprache, Tradition und Zusammengehörigkeitsgefühl vereinigten Kultur legte. So kann man im Rückblick noch einmal staunen über den Reichtum eines durch gegenseitige Anregung gesteigerten, aus vielen Quellen genährten Schriftwesens, das freilich nicht immer wesentlich, nicht jederzeit hochwertig, aber immer eigenartig ist und vom urwuchsischen Bauerntum Tirols zur Kaffeehausliteratur Wiens, vom katholischen Ordenspriester bis zum Chassidismus Martin Bubers reicht. Volle Einheitlichkeit des Blickpunkts in diese Mannigfaltigkeit zu bringen, wurde zu vergewaltigender Konstruktion führen müssen. Wir werden es noch früh genug erleben. So nimmt man es lieber in Kauf, daß das Werk hier und da wiederholt, zuweilen—and dies ist der Fall in der Ausbreitung über die Provinzen—einem Dichterlexikon nahe kommt, in dem eine Tracht von Tatsachenmaterial angehauft und zugänglich gemacht wird.

Freilich ist der Kreis etwas weit gespannt, wenn (S. 1511) der zu St. Louis geborene und gestorbene John Rothensteiner, Sohn eines Südtirolers und einer Westfalin, hier erscheint oder gar Paul Ernst, weil er sich "oft in Österreich aufgehalten, besonders die letzten Lebensjahre dort verbracht hat und zum österreichischen Geistesleben zeit lebens gute Beziehungen unterhalten".

Mit der 11. Abteilung setzt aber wieder eine straffere Gliederung ein. Kapitel 6 (meist von E. Castle) behandelt die Versuche einer Erneuerung von Kunst und Leben durch Festspiel und Volkstheaterbewegung, Kapitel 7 ist beherrscht von der Darstellung

Hermann Bahrs (Castle), Schnitzlers (Kainz), Hofmannsthals (Rieger), Rilkes (Koch) und Karl Kraus' (Rollet) (Beilauf erwähnt für die Weite des Horizonts sei, daß Schnitzlers starke Wirkung aufs Ausland und besonders Amerika nicht vergessen ist) In Kapitel 9 ist vor allem die ausgedehnte Bibliographie der Theateraufführungen von besonderem Wert (Castle) und erfreulich die Einbeziehung des Lichtspiels (L. Schulz) Kapitel 10 ist dem Expressionismus, Kapitel 11 dem "Weg zur neuen Sachlichkeit" gewidmet Hier erfährt durch E. Nack die Kriegsliteratur eine sachliche Darstellung, ungetrüb von dem neuen Heroismus, der im achten Bande der Reklamserie (*Politische Dichtung*) Ethos und historischen Ablauf verfälscht und für den ein Dr. Ernst Volkmann, Geheimrat, verantwortlich zeichnet "am zwanzigsten Jahrestag des Kriegausbruchs" Dem neuen Roman sind fast 100 Seiten eingeräumt

Rückblick und Ausblick vom Herausgeber sowie ein umfassendes Register schließen diese, vor vierzig Jahren begonnene Publikation, ein Monumentalwerk von 4300 Seiten Text und 1300 Abbildungen, die weder Forscher noch Bibliothek entbehren kann Dem Verlage sowie dem Herausgeber, der im Jahre 1913 die Fortführung unternahm, ist damit eine Dankeschuld abzutragen

Übrigens ist von den zwei letzten Bänden eine Sonderausgabe erschienen als *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in Österreich-Ungarn im Zeitalter Franz Josephs I. 1848-1918* (Mk 32 - der Band).

Der zweite Band der Van Stockum-Van Damschen Literaturgeschichte halt, was der erste (siehe *MLN* 1935, 338) versprach und bringt außerdem auf 32 Seiten eine gut ausgewählte Bibliographie, die sich natürlich auf das Notigste beschränken muß, aber in ihren Angaben genau ist und bis auf das Erscheinungsjahr geht

Der Text gliedert sich in 15 Kapitel, beginnend mit der Aufklärung, die ohne das übliche Vorurteil dargestellt ist, und endend mit der Dichtung des Dritten Reiches, deren Katholizität freilich seitdem schon in vielen Fällen revisionsbedürftig geworden ist. Aber die Stärke des Buches liegt überhaupt nicht in den letzten Kapiteln, die durch größere Beschränkung auf die Hauptpersonen und ihre Bedeutung für die in ihnen dargestellten Strömungen vielleicht hatten gewinnen können Schon der 40. Abschnitt mit dem etwas zweifelhaften Titel *Neuklassik und Neuromantik* hatte ohne Griesebach, Kinkel und Roquette auskommen können. Vorzüglich dagegen sind die Definitionen und Inhaltsangaben der ersten Kapitel, etwa der Theorien Lessings und Herders, die Verknüpfungen mit der Literatur des Auslands Mit wenigen Worten wird hier viel gesagt. Zwischen Klassik und Spätklassik wird die Romantik eingeschoben, beide Strömungen werden philosophisch fundiert Die Biedermeierdichtung erscheint in einem eigenen Abschnitt, dessen Eingang vielleicht die positive Seite zu

schwach herausarbeitet, auch die politische Lyrik hatte starker differenziert werden können

Indessen ist es unbillig, von einem solchen Leitfadens, der vielen Zwecken gerecht werden muß, eine Festlegung auf zu strenge Auslese und auf ausführliche Abhandlung zu fordern. Dieses Werk ist, scheint mir, die brauchbarste Darstellung für den amerikanischen Studenten, da sie weder durch Fülle verwirrt noch Urvaterhausrat unbesehen weitergibt und Stromungen klar herauszuarbeiten sucht

Der Prestelsche Abriss, aus dessen Untertitel sich die volkische Einstellung ergibt, die durch den katholischen Blickpunkt noch weiter beschränkt wird, ist in den Anfängen mit ausführlichen Inhaltsangaben aus den Epen vielversprechend. Dann aber wird er sprunghaft und zusammenhanglos. Die Renaissance als nicht volkhaft fehlt, der Barock ist höchst dürftig. Lohensteins *Arminius* erhält wegen seiner patriotischen Tendenz eine ganze Seite, soviel wie der *Simplizissimus*. Die Aufklärung ist undeutsch, überfremdet, platter Optimismus. "Man tut sich viel zu gut auf die Emanzipierung des Judentums und einen verschwommenen Toleranzbegriff" (81). *Werther* bekommt 3 Zeilen, Wezels *Herrmann und Ulrike* 11. Nach dem *Gotz* heißt es, "Leider blieb Goethe selbst nicht auf der mit seinem *Gotz* betretenen Bahn des nationalen Volksschauspiels" (107). Daß das *Junge Deutschland* und Heine nie existiert haben, versteht sich von selbst. Auch Schnitzler hat nie gelebt. "Ebenfalls am Jahrhundertbeginn setzt sich bereits das absteigende Bürgertum sein dekadentes Denkmal in Thomas Manns Lubecker Kaufmannsroman *Buddenbrooks*"

Vogelpohl ist lesbarer und besonnener. Die Gegenwart wird hier ausführlicher auf 80 Seiten (gegen 162 S. des übrigen Teils) behandelt und ist daher, wenn man einmal den Standpunkt kennt, nicht ganz unbrauchbar. Thomas Mann freilich ist nicht erwähnt. Ricarda Huch bekommt wenigstens noch halb so viel Platz wie ihr schuillige Harzburger Vetter, den man plötzlich entdeckt hat. Heine ist genannt als "Ausbeuter der Romantik, dem nichts mehr heilig war". Denn "mit den Juden drang ein fremder Geist in unser Volksleben ein und drohte es zu vergiften, wie die Folgezeit bewiesen hat". Lessings Toleranzgedanke wird allerdings noch verteidigt, da "die helfende Liebe zu den Mitmenschen eine Grundforderung des Christentums ist" und da man ja zu seiner Zeit noch nicht entdeckt hatte, "daß es rassische Unterschiede gibt, die sich auch im Glauben und Denken äußern."

Wo immer solche Streitfragen nicht in Betracht kommen, ist das Buch zuverlässig und auch wegen des einfachen Stils im Unterricht brauchbar. Daß das "eine Ziel" der Dichtung der Gegenwart, "Deutschland und die deutsche Seele," ein Dilemma enthält, muß dieser Einstellung notgedrungen verborgen bleiben.

Geschichte der deutschen Sprache VON DR ADOLF BACH. Mit 6 Karten Leipzig Quelle und Meyer, 1938 Pp 240

This valuable book treats the subject matter from the dialect atlas method angle. It contains two main parts (*Vorgeschichte der deutschen Sprache*, pp 19-58, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, pp 58-234), a concluding chapter called "*Sprache und Nation*" (pp 232-234), a short index (pp 235-240), and six maps, five of which are illustrations of "*Mundartenforschung*" proper. It is an admirably executed work and gives the beginner a fairly comprehensive survey over a vast and complicated field. Bach has incorporated many views and theories of more recent origin, notably Wrede's "*Ingwaonentheorie*," Karstien's rejection of a "*westgerm. Sprachinheit*," Fritzsche's modification of Burdach's opinion on the preponderance of the Chancellery in Prague under Charles IV. Bach also maintains a clearly defined distinction between Middle High German (1050-1350), Early New High German (1350-1650), and New High German proper (since 1650).

The most striking feature of presentation is the overworking of the term "*Strahlung*" which the author uses somewhat beyond the proper territory of the dialect atlas method of investigation. This reviewer feels that the author discredits essential results of historical "*Mundartenforschung*" thereby. Particularly in the discussion on the rise and origin of the "*Gemeinsprache*" the old terms like '*borrowing*' or '*loanword*' explain the incorporation of dialectical features sufficiently without recourse to "*nord-südliche Strahlung*" and the like.

At times, the interpretation of facts seems to be too dogmatic even for an elementary book. Thus, in view of the prodigiously large literature on the sound shifts, an unqualified statement like

Als Erste oder Germ Lautverschiebung bezeichnen wir eine Reihe von lautlichen Veränderungen, die miteinander weder in ursächlicher Beziehung stehen noch sich zu gleicher Zeit durchgesetzt haben (p 30),

should have been modified, because the book is to serve as an introduction for beginners who shall be made to see problems as well as undisputed facts. Also, more restraint might have been observed in those matters which touch on the philosophical aspects and evaluations of the German language. On such controversial subjects a separate book should be written.

By and large, Bach's book is a really excellent exposition of the development of the language under the dialect method angle, and it will fill a gap among the many books on the subject. It should be said, however, that the various short bibliographies listed at the end of most paragraphs are amazingly destitute of American entries. It is hoped that in a second edition this shortcoming will be remedied.

GEORGE NORDMEYER

West Virginia University

Social Ideals in German Literature 1770-1830 By LUDWIG W
KAHN, University of Rochester New York Columbia Uni-
versity Press 1938 108 Pp

The author through brief analyses and comparisons of representative works of the three periods, Storm and Stress, Classicism, and Romanticism, sets into sharp relief the differences of social ideals developed and expressed in these movements. He succeeds in clarifying ideas and ideals and arrives by means of constant reference and contrast at precise and clear definitions.

A treatise like this, written in English for a non-German public and pithily presented with a laconic self-denial is most useful and instructive. One might have wished that quotations had been translated since many of them are difficult to render and need an interpretative transposition. At the same time, it cannot be overlooked that the virtue of briefness in this outline leads to dangerous simplifications (of which the author himself is not oblivious) especially when definitions are not wary of common misconceptions in the public mind which they should forestall. Thus the word *selfgratification* used in connection with the ideal of personal freedom and self-realization in Storm and Stress will necessarily seem to justify the current prejudice of Goethe as a philanderer particularly since the concept of the *Damon* as a guiding force is overlooked and since the tragic tension between static law and dynamic life is lost sight of in the personality of the genius. Thus *Werther*, stripped of the philosophy of its ethical naturalism, becomes a mere love story (primarily through misinterpretation of such central themes as the discussion on suicide, p. 16), *Stella* a "pleasant" *ménage à trois*, while in *Gotz* the peculiar reactionary revolutionism is put on the same plane with Lenz' rationalistic perfectibility.

In the chapter on Romanticism a quotation from Schleiermacher's *Monologen* concerning the idea that every individual should represent humanity in his own individual way (*Monolog II*) might have facilitated the understanding of the concepts *community* and *society*, which without a knowledge of Tönnies or some further clarification are not as selfevident as the author seems to assume. The emphasis on a separation of love and procreation, of religion and ethics, which Schleiermacher makes, might also have added to an insight into Romantic Philosophy. Kleist's standpoint in *Das Erdbeben von Chili*, as expressed on p. 76, would not be much different from Schiller's idea in *Kabale und Liebe*. But, on the whole, the transition from individualism to collective ideas is well traced.

The chapter Classicism lends itself more easily to simplification so that here the critical reader will find Kahn's gift of condensation at its best. But in spite of vigorous strictures in the other parts he will probably concur in our judgment of the usefulness and real achievement this book represents. (Pathos, by the way is not Pathos, p. 56!)

Grundfragen der Phonometrie Von EBERHARD ZWIRNER und KURT ZWIRNER Berlin, Verlag Metten & Co, 1936 Pp xi + 140 = Phonometrische Forschungen, Untersuchungen und Texte zur Sprachvergleichung durch Mass und Zahl, Reihe A Methoden und Ergebnisse, Band 1

"The aim of the present volume is to give historical and scientific justification for the method of *phonometrie*" Such is the authors' introductory statement of their purpose, but what does the term *phonometry* mean? Anticipating their long argument, the authors define it in one place as 'nothing but comparative linguistics, carried on with the technique of physiology, physics, psychology, and mathematics' But it is—in their view—emphatically not a borderline science somewhere between the domains of linguistics, psychology, physics, and comparative physiology, a definition which at once recalls Panconzelli-Calzia's "Begriff, Aufgabe und Abgrenzung der experimentellen Phonetik" (Experimentelle Phonetik, 1921) To illustrate P-C in examining a certain speech-sound would inquire how it is produced by a German, Italian, or Chinese, as recorded on a phonograph, cymograph, or X-ray-film, and he might investigate how the sound was heard by various listeners out of a jumble of nonsense words and sounds, played off from a grammophone record, etc, etc. The Zwirners on the other hand are interested only in the question how a certain speech-sound, as spoken on a grammophone record by a member of a certain linguistic community, is heard and recorded by other members of the same linguistic community If the written records are 100% in agreement with the sound on the grammophone record, it means that its speech-sound has been identified by the listeners with their corresponding language phoneme (or sound) Often, however, this is not the case By tabulating the deviations the Zwirners get a mathematical, statistical approach to the linguistic changes going on in the community, at least as far as such changes hinge upon the element of imperfect apperception by the hearer of the spoken sound By such methods the Zwirners obtain what they call phonometrical texts

Obviously one of phonometry's main theoretical props is Saussure's distinction between speech and language, a distinction which also plays an important part in the definitions of the phoneme While there is not a complete parallelism, one may say that the relation between experimental phonetics (as practised by Rousselot, Scrip-ture, E A Meyer, Porot, and P Calzia) and phonometry is somewhat like the relation between the old phonetics (of Sweet, Sievers, Jespersen, and Malone) and the phonology or phonemics of the Prague school.

The strictly linguistic and historical point of view of the Zwirners

is something for which linguists should be thankful. Not a few of the studies of experimental phonetics have little value for the linguists, because of the fact that the experimentators were not interested in language or speech primarily but in some abstruse element of the physiology or the physics of the phonation. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the Zwirners are unjust in their criticism of older experimental phoneticians, for even the crudest experiment sometimes can help to solve problems baffling to the sharpest of ears.

The Zwirners devote almost half their book to a historical survey of the idea of phonometry, beginning with the ancient Greek and Romans and leading up to the phoneticians of the 19th century. Interesting are the statistics showing the frequency of works termed *phonetical* throughout the 19th century, as well as the remark that the term was first used by the Egyptologist Georg Zoega in 1797 (pp 44 and 49). But as their most immediate precursor the Zwirners regard Robert Gordon Latham, who in a completely unnoticed article in the *London, Edinburgh and Dublin Philosophical Magazine*, 1841 (vol xviii, p 123 ff) laid the foundation for their theory of phonometry (pp. 46-48).

Space does not allow any adequate summary or discussion of this historical part of the work. One more remark I should, however, like to make. When Helmont in *Naturalphabet der heiligen Schrift* 1677 has the idea that the letters are to represent not only their sound but also their articulation, he is obviously carrying on theories which can be traced back to the grammarians of the 12th century (cf Anne Holtzmark, *En islandsk scolasticus fra det 12. århundrede*, *Skifter utg av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi* 1 Oslo, II, hist.-fil. kl. 1936 No 3, pp 42-43, 87 and elsewhere).

All considered, the book, with its fresh point of view makes highly stimulating reading, even where one does not fully agree with the authors. And that their own methods are well considered and therefore liable to lead to interesting results, there can be no doubt. Thus one should look forward to further volumes of the *Phonometrische Forschungen* with considerable interest.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Johns Hopkins University

Les gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi;
T. II, *Études lexicographiques*. Par D. S. BLONDHEIM. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. \$2.50. (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Extra Volume XI.)

La présentation de ce tome II est fort bien comprise. Il s'ouvre par un exposé que Miss Grace H. Blondheim et Mrs. Eleanor Dulles

Blondheim donnent de sa genèse et de son plan. Ensuite une "prefatory note" du professeur Edward C. Armstrong retrace en termes d'une émotion contenue le portrait de Blondheim étudiant et érudit, elle insiste notamment sur la valeur de ses études lexicographiques et elle salue en lui le pionnier aux Etats-Unis d'une idée qui actuellement en France, sous l'énergique et habile direction de M. Mario Roques, marche à grands pas vers sa réalisation : la constitution d'un dictionnaire qui serait pour la langue française ce que le dictionnaire d'Oxford est pour la langue anglaise. Enfin viennent le *Curriculum Vitae* et la *Bibliography of the Publications of D. S. Blondheim* (cette dernière ne comprenant pas moins de 87 articles). Ces deux documents—auxquels il eût été bon d'ajouter la liste des articles nécrologiques relatifs à notre regretté confrère—ramassent, en un frappant raccourci, la variété des occupations et la multiplicité des intérêts qui ont sollicité une vie trop courte mais admirablement remplie.

En ce qui concerne le texte posthume, c'est au meilleur spécialiste actuel des études hébréo-romanes, le Dr Raphael Levy, qu'on s'est adressé pour le mettre au point. Grâce à sa compétence dans les langues romanes et dans le domaine hébraïque, grâce aussi à sa familiarité avec la pensée de celui qui avait été son maître, le Dr Raphael Levy a surmonté les difficultés inextricables que présentaient le maniement et le remaniement des matériaux mis à sa disposition, et il a parfaitement réussi à reproduire le son juste, net et plein que l'auteur n'aurait pas manqué de donner à sa rédaction.

Telles qu'elles se présentent, ces études fourmillent de renseignements nouveaux, de rapprochements ingénieux et de découvertes précieuses. On sent que D. S. Blondheim avait, quand il le composait, atteint la plénitude de ses moyens et qu'il possédait l'absolue maîtrise de sa méthode. Pour se rendre compte du parti qu'il a tiré de ces loazim, il suffit de se reporter à l'un quelconque de ses articles. Les plus courts (cf. 74. *astre*, 82. *baves*, 199. *chesne*) comme les plus fouillés (cf. 1. *acier*, 5. *adorser*, 7. *adrement*, 18. *aigrum*, 31. *aloisne*, 63. *aresta*, 68. *arondele*, 72. *aspre*, 83. *balde-monre*, 409. *espaldon*, 842. *popedes*) offrent un régal aussi savoureux que substantiel. Pour chacune de ses reconstitutions l'auteur procède avec le mélange de prudence et de hardiesse nécessaire en un terrain aussi mouvant; il répond ainsi aux objections qu'on avait adressées à son système de transcription tel qu'il se trouve au tome I. S'il y a une erreur, il est le premier à la redresser. Voyez plutôt les articles 18, 63, 113, 137 etc., tome II, où il apporte des corrections à ses propres explications du tome I. Voyez aussi le son avec lequel il relève les inexactitudes les plus diverses (cf. p. 48, iv, p. 61, ii, p. 70, iv, p. 75, ii et iv, p. 78, ll. 14-25, p. 94, ll. 16-22). Sa soif de précision apparaît jusque dans les plus petits détails de sa documentation (cf. *art.* 83, p. 123, n. 2; *art.* 103, p. 127, ll. 13-14. Pour 66. *arestuel*, il m'a confié lui-même qu'il

en était "obsédé et tourmenté," et, pour parvenir aux conclusions consignées p 111, il avait visité plusieurs de nos musées) Sa finesse trouve plus particulièrement à s'exercer dans les discussions étymologiques (cf. 2 *açoper*, 6 *adrelces*, 14 *broutené*, p 63, 40. *amortides*, II, 49 *apendiz*, 50 *apentiz*, 62 *ardeficte*) Enfin son ingéniosité s'est avisée d'une base provisoire mais fort pratique pour déterminer la datation des mots. Il compare les gloses de Raschi d'une part et d'autre part les textes dépouillés par E Stengel dans son *Wörterbuch der ältesten französischen Sprache (Ausgaben und Abhandlungen* I, 1882) et le vocabulaire de la *Chanson de Roland*, et il maique du signe + chacun des loazim qui n'a de correspondant ni dans le Stengel ni dans notre vieux poème Grâce à ce système, évidemment sujet à révision, mais qui n'en constitue pas moins un excellent point de repère, il se fait fort d'accorder un brevet "d'ancestrerie" à plus de la moitié des mots qu'il a examinés Proportion considérable et qu'on retrouve tant dans le reste des *Commentaires du Talmud* que dans les *Commentaires de la Bible*

Voilà quelques-uns des mérites que l'on a tenu à signaler parmi tous ceux qui donnent tant de prix à ces pages d'outre-tombe Ils suffisent pour faire pardonner quelques omissions presque inévitables dans les circonstances où a eu lieu la présente publication Pour 183 *chalve soriz*, on aurait dû consulter Emil Eggenschwiler, *Die Namen der Fledermaus auf dem französischen und italienischen Sprachgebiet*, Vogel, Engelsdorf-Leipzig, 1934, 8° 299 p Pour 192. *chastaignes* pris dans le sens de *châtagniers* et mis en parallèle avec *lor* = *laurier*, on aurait pu ajouter l'analogie de *tet* ou *ti*, loaz 102 de Gerschon de Metz, qui signifie *tilleul* Pour les patois lorrains Léon Zéliqson, *Dictionnaire des patois romans de la Moselle*, Librairie Istra, Paris et Columbia University Press, New York, 1922-1924, aurait en plusieurs cas constitué une utile addition à L. Adam, *Les Patois lorrains* Péchés véniels, en vérité. La grande pitié c'est que ce recueil ne traite qu'un si faible nombre de gloses 125 sur 1102, c'est aussi qu'on n'ait retrouvé aucune trace des importantes parties signalées au tome I p iv, II 18-19, et au tome II p 7, II 12-15 Mais D S Blondheim a donné l'essentiel les matériaux et la méthode. Nul doute que son œuvre ne soit poursuivie pour l'honneur de sa mémoire et le bénéfice de la lexicographie romane.

LOUIS BRANDIN

University of London

Répertoire des Lexiques du Vieux Français, par RAPHAEL LEVY.

New York Modern Language Association of America, 1937.

Pp. x + 65

Professor Levy's aim has been to collect and present a complete list of dictionaries and alphabetical glossaries of Old French. He

has spared no pains to make his list accurate and serviceable. Section I consists of dictionaries and of such anthologies and collections as are provided with an extensive glossary, while Sections II-VI deal with works of the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries respectively, arranged in each case in the alphabetical order of the editors' names. Section VII consists of an index to the foregoing, arranged in the alphabetical order of the titles. Section VIII lists works for which a glossary is still lacking. In the final section Professor Levy goes beyond the prescribed limits in order to list glossaries or lexicographical studies on modern French authors. An index of all editors mentioned and a list of American libraries in which the rarer items are to be found complete the volume.

The above brief description shows how well the requirements of the scholar have been anticipated and how carefully the material has been arranged. It should be added that the subject-index (Section VII) contains further useful information, particularly under such general headings as "Anglo-Normand," "Dictionnaires," "Étymologie."

The value of such a repertory as this depends very largely upon its completeness, and here one might join issue with Professor Levy on the principles set out in his *Avant-propos*. He proposed to omit all editions with glossaries 'dont l'étendue est minime,' but the number of entries is not necessarily an indication of the value of a glossary, and such a principle was bound to prove difficult to observe. Similarly the limitation of the repertory to glossaries or lists alphabetically arranged results in a selection which at times appears arbitrary. P. Barbier's *Miscellanea Lexicographica* are listed, but not his important "Noms de poissons" (*Rev des langues rom* and elsewhere), D. S. Blondheim, "Contribution à la lexicographie française d'après les sources rabbiniques," but not C. Bernheimer, "Deux fragments d'un glossaire hébreu-fr du XIII^e siècle," *Rev des Études Juives*, 149 (1923), Grober, *Altfrz Glossen* and A. Owen, *Le Traité de Walter de Bibbesworth*, but not the similar publications of P. Meyer, Priebisch, etc.

It would appear that a natural reluctance to omit certain lexicographical works of undoubted value and interest has led Professor Levy to depart at times from the principles with which he began. The effect of this is not serious and amounts to little more than an occasional impression of arbitrariness and incompleteness. The practical usefulness of the repertory remains unaffected, and the author is to be congratulated on the valuable addition he has made to the equipment of the French lexicographer.

A. EWERT

Oxford University

Anti-Slavery Opinion in France during the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century By EDWARD D SEEBER. Baltimore Johns Hopkins Press, 1937 Pp 238.

The treatment of the slavery question in France during the eighteenth century has by no means passed unnoticed by scholars interested in this period. Professor Jameson's *Montesquieu et l'esclavage, étude sur les origines de l'opinion antiesclavagiste en France au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1911) is a notable work. More recently, Mr. C. O. Hardy has published *The Negro Question in the French Revolution* (Menasha, Wis., 1919), while Miss Anna J. Cooper has studied the same period in *L'Attitude de la France à l'égard de l'esclavage pendant la Révolution* (Paris, 1925). The works of Professor Jameson, Mr. Hardy, and Miss Cooper are not particularly concerned, however, with the rise and spread of anti-slavery opinion in France during the period between the publication of the *Esprit des lois* (1748) and the beginning of the French Revolution. It is to this second half of the century that Mr. Seeber has devoted special attention in his recent study.

The material of Mr. Seeber's treatise is arranged chronologically in three parts. Part I deals with the period from the *Esprit des lois* to the American Revolution, Part II, from the American Revolution to the French Revolution, and Part III, from the French Revolution to the *Génie du christianisme*. Such an arrangement suggests that there must have been an evolution in anti-slavery opinion from 1748 to 1802, and yet the main outlines of this evolution are not readily apparent. Interest in the humanitarian treatment of slaves, if one may judge from the material presented, seems as prevalent in the prerevolutionary as in the revolutionary period. Opinions on the legality of slavery are as strong, though not so numerous, in the years preceding the American Revolution as in those between the American and French Revolutions. Economic arguments against slavery do not seem to vary between 1748 and 1802. Nor do solutions to the slavery problem advanced by contemporaries of Voltaire and Rousseau differ radically from those presented by Brissot de Warville. As a matter of fact, only one evolution in the slavery question is apparent in Mr. Seeber's work, and that only by inference. Dominantly a moral issue in the 50's and 60's, slavery seems to have become a philosophical problem in the 70's and 80's, and a political problem in the 90's. In the meantime, the Negro had become more interesting than the question of slavery, he became a literary figure, rather than the object of a political issue. It could hardly have been otherwise. Mr. Seeber has judiciously noted (p. 9) that "slavery is not a subject that stands alone as a social or legal problem. Adaptable to varied tastes and treatments, it is found under many guises, and often allied with exoticism, primitivism, sentimentalism, and humanitarianism." In his search for opinions on slavery, Mr. Seeber has had recourse not

only to the works of the Philosophes, but to those of travelers, novelists, playwrights, and poets. It is regrettable that all of these elements have not been separated, so that one might know, for instance, just what rôle sentimentalism or humanitarianism played in the formation of anti-slavery opinion. It is more regrettable that some distinction has not been made between the moral aspects of the slave trade, the legal aspects of slavery and the Negro as a literary figure of the time.

The result of Mr. Seeber's research is surprising and, due to the fact that he has refrained from summarizing his conclusions, slightly confusing. He has documented himself exceedingly well in the anti-slavery literature of the time. The bibliography, which he has covered with extraordinary conscientiousness, is enormous. From these works he has extracted copious quotations which present admirably the opinions of the authors studied. However, he has failed to indicate clearly the general direction of anti-slavery opinion and to show the specific relationship between this opinion and the philosophical movement of the eighteenth century. One would like to know more about the struggle of the Philosophes to reconcile their theories of liberty and equality with the slavery question. One would like to know how much humanitarian pre-occupations with slavery led to the formation of the theories expressed in the Rights of Man. To be sure, these and other similar problems lie beyond the scope of Mr. Seeber's thesis. Those, however, who seek their solution, will find considerable assistance in his solidly documented work.

IRA WADE

Princeton University

Proverbes en rimes Text and illustrations of the Fifteenth Century from a French Manuscript in the Walters Art Gallery Baltimore By GRACE FRANK and DOROTHY MINER Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937 Pp. 117 and 186 plates.

Présenté avec science et avec goût c'est un document humble, naïf mais savoureux et précieux sur les aspects quotidiens du quinzième siècle. Le manuscrit Walters de Baltimore qui contient ces "proverbes rimés" et illustrés est un des très rares survivants d'un genre très populaire mais dont nous ne connaissons jusqu'ici comme spécimens que le ms 37527 add. du British Museum et le fragment de Gap publié par Gustave Cohen. Le ms Walters est l'aîné de cette petite famille. Il comporte 182 huitains dont chacun est accompagné d'une illustration. Par exemple, au huitain xvi dont le mot de la fin est le proverbe

Qui trop embrasse, peu estraint

correspond l'image d'un quidam chargé sur son épaule droite d'une

douzaine de petites poutres. Ce faix trop lourd et mal réparti semble couler hors des bras courtauds du présomptueux porteur. L'auteur anonyme du recueil en question embrasse peu, n'a pas de prétention et étreint assez bien sa matière. Ce n'est certes pas un écrivain mais il dit bien ce qu'il veut dire ou plutôt ce que les proverbes veulent dire. A ce propos, ce curieux livret semble être à deux fins didactique et morale, bien entendu, mais aussi explicative tout bonnement de certaines expressions proverbiales dont le sens n'était pas toujours clair. Il y a là ainsi une sorte de glossaire à images et bilingue, comme le dit très justement Grace Frank, car il parle la langue du texte et celle des dessins. Il est même permis de se demander si le caractère de *charade*, de jeu figuratif n'est pas au fond plus marqué ici que le caractère de *morale*, celui de renseignement plus que celui d'enseignement, si on peut dire. En tout cas il est heureux pour nous que le vieil assembleur de ces proverbes ait exprimé dans une langue terre à terre une sagesse terrienne car lui et son illustrateur nous ont fourni sur la comédie humaine triviale de leur temps, entre le temps de Villon et celui de Rabelais, une série d'aperçus d'une précision cocasse et qui parfois (*Plates* IV, V, VI, VIII, XXII, LXIII, C, CIV, CLXII) sont, bien que sans grand art, dans la grande tradition de la caricature française. Mains de ces dessins seraient plus dignes d'illustrer telles œuvres genre farce du quinzième siècle que les bois dont ces œuvres ont été pourvues par les libraires du temps. Certains Iraient comme un gant à tels vers de Villon et d'autres à tel passage de Rabelais. (Cf., par exemple, pour la marine de ce dernier, le vaisseau de haut bord de l'illustration XLIII). De ces images, parfaitement étudiées par Miss Miner qui a pris à sa charge l'iconographie tandis que Mrs Frank décrivait et explorait le texte, il ne faut pas surfaire la valeur d'art mais leur intérêt est très grand. Il est d'ailleurs difficile de distinguer cet intérêt de celui du texte avec lequel elles collent fidèlement. On pourrait cependant essayer de dire le charme instructif et la signifiante de cette œuvre naïve et narquoise. C'est de la langue, c'est de la vie de tous les jours et de tous les coins de rue et de campagne et habillées "comme cela se trouve," alors que les œuvres plus distinguées et que de beaux mss nous ont gardées ont toujours un peu l'air d'avoir été faites un Dimanche et ne sentent pas comme celle-ci la bonne grosse vie semainière.

Nous ne pouvons analyser ici les études que dans l'*Introduction* (pp 1-33), dans les *Notes*, le *Glossaire* et les *Listes* les éditeurs ont consacrées au texte et aux illustrations. Mrs G. F. nous y donne une fois de plus la preuve de cette remarquable érudition que M. Mario Roques, un bon juge et peu suspect de coutumière indulgence, a récemment louée dans *Romania*. Pour l'étude des illustrations elle a été fort dignement secondée par Miss Miner qui, d'après surtout les costumes, propose pour le ms une date et un lieu voisins de 1485 et de Lyon¹. L'auteur ou l'assembleur nous est, cela va sans dire, inconnu mais Mrs F. dessine fort bien la physionomie,

la "bonne balle" de bourgeois qu'on voit émerger avec assez de relief de son œuvre pourtant si impersonnelle. Je le soupçonne d'avoir été quelque médecin provincial pour la raison que le Médecin (huitain xcviii) est le seul personnage de métier qui prenne la parole et pour louer assez bellement la médecine. Il est vrai que cela pourrait aussi bien faire de l'auteur un malade, un patient. Mais il n'y paraît guère. Ce bonhomme que M^{rs} F. dessine avec une grande finesse de touche (p. 7), bien qu'il ne fût probablement plus jeune, respire la santé allante et active. Il hait l'oisiveté et bourgeois il ne veut pas "contrefaire le bourgeois," le rentier oisif (CLXIX). En ce même huitain il dit qu'un brave homme souffre de ne rien faire et que "pour oisiveté défaire/ Qui a loisir, il fait pannier." Son panier à lui, son œuvre de loisir, c'est ce livre où il a tressé les 182 brindilles de sagesse bourgeoise que sont ces *proverbes rimés*. Il aurait pu plus mal employer son temps et le nôtre n'aura pas été perdu si nous avons pu mettre en lumière l'éminente valeur de cet humble livre tel qu'on nous le présente de bonne et belle main.²

Harvard University

LOUIS CONS

¹ Il nous semble que le huitain III, en ses trois premiers vers/ Quand il n'y a seigneur ne dame/ Fors que gens qui ne voient goutte/ Pour gouverner ung grant royaume ne peut signifier que la dame de Beaujeu et sa régence (1483-1491). D'autre part, E. Droz dans *Humanisme et Renaissance* de Janvier-Mars 1938 détermine nettement pour la localité la région savoisienne.

² M^{rs} F. (p. 26) écrit que rien n'indique si le ms est complet ou non. Du moins il me semble qu'il a un commencement et une fin qui sont un début et une conclusion au sens propre. On relira le premier et le dernier huitains. Le dernier vers du premier h. "Me voit tel qui ne me conseille" doit être compris, d'après le texte et la gravure, comme signifiant "Tel me voit sans être vu de moi qui n'est pas mon bon ange, mon ange gardien," car la propriété de l'ange g, comme chacun sait, est de voir sans être vu et de conseiller (sens religieux, très expressif à cette époque). Cette allusion tient lieu du début invocatoire et pieux qui est de rigueur dans les poèmes moraux. En tout cas, le dernier huitain qui se termine par les mots "besoigne faite" est un *exphort* très explicite. Il faudrait voir le ms du B. M., le gros et jeune parent de celui-ci.

P. 64, l. 842 « en honneur » au lieu de « et honneur » fait le sens. De même p. 51, l. 430 « soudan (soudain) » au lieu de « son dan ». P. 78, l. 1317 il faut, pour comprendre, supprimer les *après pascience*.

P. 51 « flûtes au verjus » pour dire des paroles menteuses et dont l'insinuerité se voit est une image bizarre mais que la gravure et aussi des expressions encore vivantes (*Flûte*!, *fiddlesticks*!) expliquent. Dans la gravure on voit une espèce de page qui porte sans conviction des flûtes (instr. de musique) dans un plat. Il s'agit donc de choses que littéralement "on ne peut avaler" (au fig. croire, accepter) et qui sont accompagnées d'une sauce (*apple sauce*) qui ne peut les faire passer.

P. 61, le sens du huitain xcvii, avec l'expression "Se becq y vient, faucille y soit," que Morawski n'a pas su interpréter, est celui-ci. Le mauvais ouvrier, le fol Rogier qui prononce cette phrase, marque ainsi que, dès le début de son mauvais travail, il ne savait pas ce qu'il voulait faire, n'avait pas de méthode et de plan. Tapant au hasard sur le fer il se dit que cela finira bien par donner quelque chose. Si par hasard cela s'épouinte en bec, eh bien! cela donnera une faucille. C'est un joli proverbe.

The Poems of Jonathan Swift. Edited by HAROLD WILLIAMS
Oxford The Clarendon Press [New York Oxford University Press], 1937 3 vols. Pp lxxi + 1242. \$21 00.

Swift's Marriage to Stella By MAXWELL B. GOLD Cambridge
Harvard University Press, 1937 Pp x + 189 \$2 50.

The appearance of Mr Harold Williams's edition of Swift's poems is a memorable event. The unsatisfactory state of the text and canon of Swift's poems has been generally recognized for some years. Swift's output of verse was great and he exercised relatively little care over its publication, with the result that the eighteenth-century editors who dealt with it faced a formidable task with limited equipment. Scott's edition of the poems (1814, 1824), later adopted in the Aldine edition, though uncritical, has long remained the most satisfactory one—the modern and more accessible edition by W. E. Browning (1910) being inferior. Meanwhile there has been piling up a mass of confusing details regarding the canon, text, and dating of the poems, but with the exception of Dr F. Elrington Ball's *Swift's Verse An Essay* (1929) no consistent effort has hitherto been made to bring order out of chaos. Hence the great importance of Mr Williams's edition, which not only gives us, at last, a reliable text of the collected verse, but brings to bear upon a multitude of vexing bibliographical problems the full resources of modern scholarship. Here and there a detail can be challenged or a judgment questioned, but by reason of his unsurpassed knowledge of Swift and his command of bibliographical methods Mr Williams's work supersedes all that has been done on the poems in the past and must remain a point of departure for any later investigations.

Something must be said, in however summary a fashion, concerning both Mr Williams's methods and the results of his wide explorations. Nearly every one of Swift's poems has a separate—and often complicated—bibliography; it is Mr Williams's practice to take into account all the texts of a given poem which have any value, to record the variants in a critical apparatus, but to print not a recension but what seems to him to be the most authoritative of the several texts. It is well, perhaps, that in determining which text is the most authoritative he has refused to bind himself with fast rules, for each poem is apt to present peculiar problems. In general, however, Mr. Williams may be said to prefer a manuscript version if such exists in Swift's hand or the hand of one like Stella or Ford, closely associated with Swift, otherwise a first edition, though a later edition bearing marks of the author's editorial supervision is favoured over an unauthorized first. Mr Williams's use of manuscript material is notable: the Morgan, Harvard, John Rylands, and Huntington Libraries, the Portland papers at Longleat, Welbeck and Woburn Abbies; the British Museum, the Forster

collection, and the Ford papers—all have been drawn upon for texts in Swift's autograph or in other hands. Of nearly as great interest is the large number of first editions, including many broadsides and half-sheet editions, which plays such an important part in establishing the text, though one wishes that Mr. Williams had indicated, for the benefit of later students, where such editions now lie.

As a result of this procedure Mr Williams has been able to give new versions of several poems, among them the following the earlier (1703) version of "Vanbrug's House" is printed for the first time completely from Swift's manuscript, the 1706 version of "Baucis and Philemon" is given from Swift's autograph, which Forster used carelessly, and we have a recension—the only instance in the entire edition—of "Verses on the Death of Dr Swift."

In connection with the dating of the poems—given as nearly as possible under date of composition—and the extensive historical information placed in the notes, several interesting discoveries by Mr Williams are to be noted "The Problem" was directed not against Lord Berkeley, as hitherto supposed, but against the Earl of Romney. "Horace. Book I Ode XIV" would seem to have been composed, not in 1726, but at the height of the Wood controversy in 1724 "Death and Daphne" and "Daphne" were addressed to Lady Acheson rather than to Mrs Pilkington And from the Orrery Papers in the Harvard Library come suggested readings for lines 1, and 53 and 54 of "The Author upon Himself."

The problems of the canon are the most difficult confronting an editor of Swift's poems, and it is here that his judgment is most likely to be challenged. Something of the difficulty of the task can be gathered from the fact that over against some two hundred and fifty genuine poems, there have been attributed to Swift, questionably or without foundation, some hundred and fifty pieces Here again, in determining whether to accept or reject from the canon, Mr Williams has committed himself to no rigid laws In the absence of external facts associating a piece with Swift, he seldom falls back upon subjective evidence, though occasionally he permits himself to be swayed—and quite properly—by his sense of the Swiftian manner The rejected attributions are all discussed in the final section—a section of the utmost bibliographical value Of the pieces concerning which there has been some question and which are now admitted to the canon by Mr Williams the following may be mentioned "The First of April," "The Bank thrown Down," "A Panegyric on the Reverend D—n S—t," "A Letter from D. S-t. to D S-y.," "The Life and Genuine Character of Doctor Swift," and "The First Ode of the Seventh Book of Horace Paraphras'd." Along with these should be cited still other poems, of unquestioned authenticity, which have not hitherto appeared in any collected edition of the poems: "Verses to

Vanessa," "The Character of Sir Robert Walpole," certain of the Scriblerus "Jeux d'esprit," three "Poems from the Holyhead Journal," and "To Mr. Harlyes Surgeon"

Mention should also be made of a sixth stanza added by Mr. Williams to "In pity to the empty'ng Town," and of his discovery, among the Scriblerus trifles, of a new piece of two lines from Swift's autograph. But by far the most important addition to the canon is the piece which is almost certainly Swift's lost "Ode to the King"—probably the earliest of the youthful Pindaric odes, now retrieved from the very rare fourth (1735) volume of Fairbrother's *Miscellanies*

Mr Gold's monograph, whether it convinces us or not that Swift and Stella were in fact secretly married, will remain a very real and very valuable contribution to Swift scholarship. Mr. Gold has brought forward new material bearing on the question of the marriage, and in the appendix has given transcriptions from twenty-three autograph letters of Swift in the Pierpont Morgan library, these transcriptions correcting passages given by Ball in the *Correspondence* and adding many omitted lines—in two instances supplying whole letters not given by Ball (Swift to Arbuthnot, 13 July 1714, Swift to Orrery, 16 April 1733). The real importance of the book, however, lies in Mr Gold's clarification and impressive remmarshalling of all the evidence in favour of a marriage. Unless more information—if it exists—turns up, this should be the final statement of the case for all who hold that a marriage ceremony took place.

The theory entertained by Mr. Gold is the familiar one: about 1716 Swift and Stella were secretly married by Bishop Ashe, but they never lived together as man and wife. Mr Gold's discovery in the Harvard Library of Orrery's interleaved copy of the *Remarks* has enabled him to bring forward some new evidence, for in this copy are transcripts of letters received by Orrery from Mrs. Whiteway, who here gives an account of Sheridan's learning from Stella, while attending her in her last illness, that Swift had offered to acknowledge the marriage but that Stella had replied it was too late. This, of course, is the same account as the one given by Deane Swift, who quoted Mrs Whiteway, but it is something to have the story directly from Mrs Whiteway. When all is said, however, the strength of Mr Gold's case rests chiefly upon his cogent restatement of evidence long at hand. And since in the past this evidence has failed to convince many sceptics, it would seem that the question of the marriage is still an open one.

RICARDO QUINTANA

The University of Wisconsin

The Crescent and the Rose Islam and England During the Renaissance. By SAMUEL C CHEW New York Oxford University Press, 1937 Pp xviii + 583. \$5.00.

During the last half-century Western peoples have come to regard the Orient with increasing interest and concern. On the one hand, the Far East has appealed to our imaginations as the home of peoples strangely different from ourselves in their customs, religions, and outlooks upon life, as a region full of terror and romantic mystery. On the other hand, the East has grown in economic and political importance for us, until at the present moment the great events going on there seem to threaten the peace and stability of all civilized society. Because of these facts, we are just now the better able to understand how European folk regarded the Moslem nations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, for during this age the rise of the Ottoman empire made manifest, as the Saracen conquests had never done, the gravity of the danger in which Christendom stood. By the time of Solymán the Magnificent the Turks had built up the mightiest state in the world, and were pressing northward toward Vienna and eastward toward the borders of Italy. Though the Sultan's admirals were beaten at Lepanto, their fleets were quickly replenished, and swept the Mediterranean, while raiders from the vassal states of Northern Africa scoured the Atlantic and threatened shipping even in the English Channel and the Irish Sea. Christian merchants, unwilling to relinquish their hold upon a rich eastern trade, sent out factors to negotiate with the potentates of Islam, raised ransom and tribute money, armed ships, and sought to stir up their governments to provide military and naval protection for their interests. Kings and Popes endeavored now to overawe, now to conciliate, the Grand Signior, trying at one moment to enlist his aid against their neighboring princes, at another to organize crusades to annihilate him. The power and invulnerability of the infidel became a fearsome legend, his name the symbol of viciousness and horrid cruelty. But the might that made him hated also made him known. The historian and the pamphleteer recorded his doings, ministers of the True Faith preached against him from a thousand pulpits, travellers sought him out to learn his customs and manners, and all Europe became eager to read about him.

In *The Crescent and the Rose* Professor Chew has shown, with great erudition and much lively detail, through what channels and by the operation of what forces Renaissance Englishmen were brought into contact with the Mohammedan East, and how they acquired their ideas about it. He begins his book with chapters on Tales and Tale Bearers and The Classical and Biblical Past which establish the atmosphere in which the Elizabethan mind moved by giving an account of the history of travel and the production of travel books about Egypt and the Levant from late

Mediaeval through Renaissance times. He next describes the fears aroused by the then Present Terror of the World, the Ottoman empire, and describes the numerous lamentations, exhortations, warnings, and dismal prophecies for which Turkish activities gave occasion. The interest in the East thus dolorously displayed was encouraged and widened by the growth of the trading Companies whose ventures were productive of a larger knowledge of Islam, and whose interests made the establishment of diplomatic relations between England and the Porte (with its unruly African dependencies) inevitable. Sporadic efforts were made to bring about some sort of connection between England and the remoter Persia, too, and the exploits of the famous Sherley brothers supply material for some of Professor Chew's most entertaining chapters, from which the reader learns about the most romantic projects and adventures on record, even from the Elizabethan age. Of much more importance as far as Englishmen in general were concerned were the depredations of the Moorish corsairs who, besides offering a constant threat to commerce, enslaved thousands of English and Irish folk, and presented a problem too great for English diplomacy, or the English navy, to solve. The difficulties here were made more considerable by the hatred and prejudices of the opposed Christian and Mohammedan faiths, and the quality of Western thought on this subject is well set forth in the chapter on The Prophet and His Book, in which are summarized the accounts of the false religion and its founder which inflamed the imaginations and stirred the hearts of True Believers for many generations. With this background made plain, the attitude taken toward the Moslem in literature, especially in dramatic literature, becomes easily intelligible. Professor Chew has carefully defined the motifs and themes suggested to the Elizabethans by their knowledge of the Mussulman, describing the elaborate masques and the sensational water-fights in which Orientals figured, and dwelling on the appearance of Turkish, Moorish, or Persian characters (usually in the rôle of bloody tyrant, or heartless Machiavellian villain) in stage plays. It must be admitted that not many pieces of first-rate artistic value were contrived from materials supplied by the travel books or Ottoman histories, yet Professor Chew shows how valuable his special knowledge is by using it for the elucidation of difficult passages in the works of Marlowe, Shakespeare, and many another writer, to the great benefit of all Elizabethan scholars. Furthermore, by bringing together in one thorough, carefully documented survey a great mass of evidence and data, he succeeds in giving proper emphasis to an aspect of Renaissance life and literature which has hitherto been treated only in a scattering and fragmentary fashion. His book, which is copiously illustrated and admirably printed, is a fascinating and valuable one, a notable contribution to literary history.

WARNER G. RICE

University of Michigan

Chronologie de la vie et de l'œuvre de Thomas Gray By ROGER MARTIN London [and New York] · Oxford University Press, 1935. Pp. 199 \$1 25

Essai sur Thomas Gray By ROGER MARTIN London [and New York] Oxford University Press, 1934. Pp x + 460 \$5 00

Thomas Gray, Scholar, the True Tragedy of an Eighteenth-Century Gentleman. By WILLIAM POWELL JONES. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937. Pp xvi + 191. \$3.50.

Poor Collins, his Life, his Art, and his Influence. By E. G. AINSWORTH. Ithaca Cornell University Press, 1937. Pp. xii + 340 \$3 00.

Thomas Gray's effort to hide his life has not succeeded, even with the unintentional assistance given him by his rather stupid first editor, William Mason, and by the inaccuracies of his first important biographer, Sir Edmund Gosse. Several devoted scholars—Matthias and Mitford in the past, and Tovey, Toynbee, and Mr. Leonard Whibley in more recent years—have gathered the materials for an understanding of Gray almost as full as that which we have long had of Dr. Johnson. And these materials have now been used by M. Roger Martin, Maître de Conférences at the University of Montpellier, in two books which form a worthy climax to a century and a half of scholarly effort.

The first of these is primarily a work of reference. In addition to a concise biography it contains brief notices of Gray's friends, analyses of his *Commonplace Books* and extracts from them, and the essay *Cambri*, printed entire. M. Martin's second and much more important book is in four parts: *Le Solitaire de Pembroke*, *Les Sentiments*, *L'Activité intellectuelle*, and *Le Poète*. In Part I the author is concerned with Gray's physical debilities as they are revealed with distressing accuracy in his "Pocket Books," and with certain psychopathic tendencies of his mind. Fascinating though these revelations may be to a certain contemporary taste, and important though they probably are to a certain kind of biographical study, the book deepens steadily, and increases in value, as it moves on to the interpretation of facts which have been longer known. Its importance does not lie in the novelty of the information it conveys so much as in the wealth of erudition and the penetrating critical thought which it brings to bear upon materials long accessible to all students. M. Martin's study of Gray's scholarship and of his ideas is sound, brilliant, and revealing. In his masterly analyses of Gray's more important English poems he has had, of course, many predecessors, but few rivals.

The word "*Essai*" in M. Martin's title is intended as an apology

for his enforced omission of several matters—among them, a critical study of Gray's letters and a tracing of his literary influence—from a work which he had hoped might be "*une monographie complète et définitive*" As it stands, however, this is by far the most comprehensive study of Gray in existence, and there is little likelihood that it will soon be superseded. Exact and minute in citation, always clear and often brilliant in style, admirably proportioned, penetrating in thought, the book is unmistakably a triumph of literary scholarship and interpretation. It brings before us a thoroughly credible man who achieved a kind of greatness in spite of many failings and foibles. It enables us to understand how a man who gave much the greater part of his time and strength to accumulative scholarship yet managed to write one great poem.

In reading M. Martin's account of Gray, although he extenuates nothing, we seem to be watching the poet grow into something resembling a hero, at least of the library. Mr. Jones, on the contrary, appears to believe that Gray's life was a gradual dwindling. And the disagreement goes farther still, for M. Martin adduces much evidence for the familiar opinion that Gray's best work in poetry was made possible by his scholarly habits and attainments, while Mr. Jones asserts in the last sentence of his book that "the poet was almost lost in the scholar, and meanwhile the 'gentleman' had turned 'virtuoso.'"

One cannot believe that Thomas Gray ever ceased to be a gentleman, and certainly he escaped virtuosity, as the word was understood in his time, both by the number and variety of his pursuits and by the cool detachment of his attitude toward them all. Even Mr. Jones, moreover, does not consistently hold that Gray's poetic powers were overwhelmed by his scholarship, for he says correctly, five pages above the sentence just quoted, that "first and last, Gray was essentially a poet." Unfortunately, this second statement is hard to square with the remark, on page 13, that "obviously poetry meant very little to Gray after the death of West." One does not see that this is obvious at all. With the exception of the "Ode to Spring," every important English poem of Thomas Gray's was composed when Richard West was in his grave.

Mr. Jones characterizes M. Martin's discussion of Gray's scholarship by the adjective "sketchy." It is true that he has devoted the major portion of his own book to a topic which his predecessor has been obliged, by the exigencies of his larger plan, to handle in no more than two concise chapters. In superficial range his study of this one topic is the more extensive of the two. It shows an adequate command of scholarly method and of the paraphernalia of literary research. M. Martin's *Essai*, however, is valuable not for these things alone but also for the quality of the thought it contains.

Professor Ainsworth's *Poor Collins* is exemplary in structure, scrupulously accurate, and highly informative. It gathers into

convenient compass all the little that is known about the life of Collins, all that is conjectured about the canon of his writings, and far more than would have been suspected about his indebtedness to various ancient and modern poets and about his influence upon English writers of later years. When one says that the author has made little effort to disguise the familiar marks of the doctoral dissertation as written in America, it will be clear that the book is not designed for convenience or pleasure in reading. Those who remember how laboriously such things are done—occasionally wondering, perhaps, why they must continue to be done at all—will find the book a thoroughly respectable performance, as much a labor of love as one of necessity. As an account of a poetic mind and life, however, and of the pains and ecstasies that go to the making of poetry, it misses its mark by the width of all the sky. What William Collins himself would have thought of it one hesitates to imagine. Probably he would have been as much amazed as anyone to learn that in his "Ode on the Popular Superstitions of the Highlands" there are precisely one hundred and twenty-two Miltonic "echoes," and that even in his "Stanzas Written on a Paper which Contained a Piece of Bride Cake" there are no less than thirteen. Or if we may suppose that he was aware of these facts and that he allowed himself to brood over them until they came to seem important, then his early decline into madness is plausibly explained.

ODELL SHEPARD

Trinity College

Mary Shelley, A Biography By R. GLYNN GRYLLE London [and New York] Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp xvi + 345. \$7.50

Miss Grylls's *Mary Shelley* justifies itself mainly on the grounds of new material. It has nothing really new before late 1822. The informed Shelley student may therefore, in spite of the lively style and enthusiasm of the author, find the first 171 pages a trifle tiresome. Beginning with September 1822, however, his interest mounts slowly but surely, for it is in the last 150 pages and the appendices that the real value of the book lies. Here are many new facts about Mary's last 29 years, a few of her unpublished letters, and excerpts from unpublished letters of Thomas Moore, T. J. Hogg, Percy Florence Shelley, and others. All these one greets with delight, for the later years of Mary's life have been too long neglected. It is not, however, that we learn so much more about Mary herself as that we get many glimpses of Shelley's old friends,—especially Claire Clairmont, Hogg, and Jane Williams. One wishes that Miss Grylls had reviewed Mary's early life more rapidly and

had devoted more space to the later years, for unquestionably the new material in her hands was sufficient for a clearer and more detailed account. In fact, when one considers the amount of hitherto inaccessible manuscript material to which Miss Grylls had access (had she not wholly neglected American libraries and collectors the amount would have been much greater), one is disappointed with the rather hasty use made of it. Particularly disappointing is the slender yield of about a dozen unprinted quotations from the original MS Journal kept by Mary, especially as but few of these are important. The account of the MS journals and of the division of the Boscombe MSS will, however, be most welcome information to Shelley scholars. One is also grateful to Miss Grylls for the valuable and highly interesting illustrations.

If one were disposed to be severe, Miss Grylls has given him ample opportunity. Her book has faults of omission, style, form, and misstatement of fact. The failure to discuss Mary's relationship with John Howard Payne and Washington Irving is a definite evasion of a biographer's duty. There was a special need for proper treatment of this matter because Sanborn's account (in *The Romance of Mary Shelley, J. H. Payne, and Washington Irving*, 1907) and the interpretations of Gribble and Massingham are both misinformed and unjust. Stanley Williams, to whom Miss Grylls refers us, has by no means explained the affair sufficiently. Mary's friendship with Payne was long and intimate, and a proper study of it will yield much to an understanding of her character. Miss Grylls's contemptuous tone with reference to Payne is quite unjustifiable. Her bibliography not only omits *The Romance*, but also the valuable *Letters of Mary Shelley* (Boston, 1918) and *The Bodleian Quarterly Record*, vi, nos. 63-64 (1929), in the latter thirteen of Mary's letters were published. The publication of all unpublished Mary Shelley letters in the Bodleian has recently been completed in the same quarterly, nos. 93-95 (1937). The word "unpublished" which appears so often is sometimes misused, even with reference to Mary's own letters. Some of these "unpublished" letters are to be found in Mrs. Marshall's *Life* as well as in less important sources. Most of the letters labelled "unpublished letters in the possession of Sir John Murray" (pp. 102, 178, 179, 191, 207) are printed in *Lord Byron's Correspondence*, ed. by Murray, 1926.

Most of Miss Grylls's errors of fact are trivial. Byron and Shelley never planned to own a boat jointly (p. 164), it was Trelawny, Williams, and Shelley who proposed partnership. Shelley did not send to England for a guitar for Jane Williams (p. 158); he asked Horace Smith at Paris to buy a harp, but that failing he bought the guitar in Italy. In the terrible days after Shelley's death Mary and Jane did not go from Pisa to Genoa (p. 168) to find Trelawny, but to Leghorn. Mary did not say anything about a place

called Palazzi (p 181), her letter from Susa in July, 1823, merely states that about Susa "are no gentlemen's seats or palazzi." It was on the continental tour of 1842, not that of 1840 (p 241), that Pearson and Knox accompanied Mary and her son, and the second tour took place in 1842, not in 1841 (pp 241, 329). The summer of 1841 was spent in Wales, not abroad (p 244). Mr and Mrs. Gisborne both died in 1836, not in 1835 (p 231). Medwin did not offer to suppress his *Conversations of Lord Byron*, 1824, if Mary would pay him an "indemnity" (p 190), his attempt at blackmail related to his *Life of Shelley*, 1847. All these are errors of carelessness.

Miss Grylls's *Mary Shelley* is valuable in many ways, but still Mrs Marshall's *Life and Letters* is the standard life. Moreover, Dowden's *Life of Shelley* gives the best account of Mary's life between 1814 and 1822, Mrs Rossetti's *Mary Shelley* the best analysis of her literary and scholarly works, Mrs. Angeli's *Shelley and His Friends in Italy* the best explanation of Mary's and Shelley's differences in Italy, Mrs. Marshall's *Life* and Ingpen's *Shelley in England* the best record of her later years, and O. W. Campbell's *Shelley and the Unromantics* the best analysis of her character.

FREDERICK L JONES

Mercer University

William Blake's Circle of Destiny By MILTON O PERCIVAL
New York Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp xii + 334
\$3 50.

This is in many ways a delightful book—charmingly presented by the Columbia Press—but in no sense a scientific one. The first sentence runs "The Circle of Destiny is not a study of sources, but a work of interpretation." There is an apologetic reference to other students of Blake, this author not being, as he expresses it, "unappreciative of their contributions" which means, mildly put, that he has used their work without mentioning their names: again an unscientific way of proceeding. "In following certain leads to their conclusions," says the author, "I was pursuing a more or less independent path." How can the reader tell, unless he is told how far previous writers have been used and what has been added?

This uncritical spirit is manifest throughout. What are we to think when we are told (p 4) "Blake is one of those who have caught God's secret"? The book begins that way, and it ends (p. 291) "To an age in which the older conceptions of God are becoming increasingly difficult to entertain, but in which the need of God is as great as ever, Blake offers a conception which is beyond

the reach of science to destroy." I would be the last to deny that Blake has a message for us—every great man of the past has, but to talk about the *older conceptions* is, if I may say it without offence, sheer nonsense. Everything that we learn every day about Blake tends to show that Blake has really nothing but those *older conceptions* to offer us, he reinterprets them up to a point, certainly, but that is only because he does not know them well; he just fills in by imagination, the gaps caused by his ignorance. Every useful piece of information in this very book goes to prove that Blake's ideas belong to the pre-Christian world. In fact, Blake's mentality is a phase of the de-christianisation of Europe in the eighteenth century, accomplished in his case, not by going forward, like Voltaire or Rousseau, but by going backwards, like Swedenborg. Those who think that truth appeared in Egypt 2,000 B. C. can of course approve of this.

This book therefore is not a contribution to an explanation of Blake. It is a record of the thoughts that arise while reading Blake in the mind of a particular reader—a fairly widely cultured and religious minded dreamer. This is what gives the book its delightful quality. A great love of Blake pervades the very writing. There are innumerable ingenious ideas mostly of a sentimental origin. There is a very large quantity of would-be translations and summarisation of Blake into plainer English. And yet, do we gain by this? Ahania "trembling, cold, in jealous fears, she sat—A Shadow of Despair" becomes "she is well aware of the insecurity of her position." Day dreaming about Blake is not a method. Here, there is not enough psychology of Blake, not enough information about what was known of occult doctrine in the eighteenth century. Boehme, or Plotinus, or the Cabala, are not in Blake as in themselves, but as felt in the eighteenth century by Blake. And Blake changed his mind or his feeling about them many times so that a system of Blake's thought is inconceivable, he had a new system nearly every time he wrote. That is the difficulty of Blake research—the fixed elements are outside Blake, and are misshapen by him in various manners at various times, not coherently all through.

DENIS SAURAT

London

On the Poetry of Pope By GEOFFREY TILLOTSON Oxford · The Clarendon Press [New York Oxford University Press] 1938. Pp viii + 179. \$3.00.

Oscar Wilde is credited with the quip that there are two ways of not liking poetry—one is not to like it, and the other is to read Pope. London students taught by Mr. Tillotson know better than that,

and this book should aid in rescuing further cases of arrested Victorianism from error. The volume is organized as an analysis of Pope's "correctness" under the headings of Nature, Design, Language, and Versification. Appended to these sections is a detailed discussion of "Stratification [complexity?] and Variety" in Pope's work, and briefer sections bring the volume to a close with specific observations on various aspects of Pope's art. Throughout, Mr. Tillotson writes with a sensitiveness and a power of stimulation that will send all lovers of good writing to have another look at Pope, and to enjoy a better understanding, if not of his mind, at least of his art. We have here doubtless the best analysis ever made of the poetic quality of Pope's writing.

After such a superlative, reservations may be in order. The book seems to assume a theory of poetry that, even if widely held, is little serviceable to Pope—though Mr. Tillotson puts an excellent face on the matter. He seems to be a "monist" critic, assuming (though not flatly declaring) that there is one true poetry, and only one. And this one true poetry seems to be tied up somehow with descriptive powers. The "Keats-like quality" of Pope's perceptions is stressed (pp. 160, 166, 171). His "cruelty and indecency" are said to be tempered "with a fine yet almost tropical beauty" (p. 156), at which point irony is prompted to remark that doubtless Hogarth and Turner had traits in common. The five pages (22-26) devoted to Pope's love of landscape are on the whole biographical rather than critical, they tell no untruths, but tend perhaps to untrue implications. Pope does not depend on the senses or on description for his achievement. In these matters the critic must nowadays be sufficiently diversitarian to allow every poet to build his Paradise out of materials of his own choice. There is little place in Mr. Tillotson's poetics for Pope's best and greatest poem, the *Essay on Man*, and Pope's concept of "truth" in satire (p. 167) is quite mis-stated.

But the volume gives a highly engaging account of the surface qualities of Pope's art. The section that most pleases the present reviewer is that on Language. Here we have the results of delicate perception and of intelligent and illuminating research into the diction of Pope's predecessors. In spite of many treatments of the topic, Tillotson's collection of specimens of poetic diction should be permanently serviceable. Strewn throughout the volume are innumerable ingenious and incisive observations such as that (p. 59) about the endings of the poems, that (pp. 139-40) concerning Pope's use of polysyllables, and the comment on the Atticus portrait (pp. 156-7), etc. etc. The "posie" of the volume might well be *Qui miscuit utile dulci*.

GEORGE SHERBURN

Columbia University

The Unextinguished Hearth, Shelley and his Contemporary Critics.

By NEWMAN I WHITE. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1938. Pp xvi + 397. \$3 00.

Students of Shelley will be grateful to Professor White for bringing between two covers all the contemporary reviews of the poet's works, thus furnishing a fair basis for sound judgment of how Shelley struck his contemporaries. But Professor White's contention that they furnish a reliable basis is not entirely borne out by the facts or by the reviews themselves. The political bias and personal animosities of the reviewers precluded any expression of their actual convictions of the literary value of any production. The author and his work were merely a springboard from which the reviewer might jump at the throat of his opponent. When a man of Walter Scott's usual high sense of honor could stoop to write laudatory anonymous reviews of his own works, what are we to expect of reviewing in general—is any review to be taken seriously? What his contemporaries really thought of Shelley still remains obscure. Professor White and the reviews he prints do make it clear, however, that, contrary to generally received opinion, Shelley was not only not ignored in his day but was actually well received in many high places. But at this point, flushed with victory, the author runs into the untenable position that "it was fear, and not dullness that motivated Shelley's more unfriendly critics." This statement calls for more documentation than is offered here.

The book is divided into: introduction, the reviews, poetic tributes to Shelley, chronological and alphabetical summaries of the reviews and of the poet's own works. Needless to say these last two sections contain valuable bibliographical materials, notwithstanding much repetition in themselves and of the work already done by Professor Marsh.

There are a number of small errors, such as "seduction" for "sedition" (p. 9), "1855" for "1885" (p. 45), "1882" for "1828" (p. 326), "February 11" for "February 2" (p. 360), "Laurence" for "Lawrence" (p. 45). The spelling of Shelley's name is not always, as on page 316, that found in the original articles, and the assertion that every volume published during Shelley's lifetime under his own name appeared between 1816 and 1823 ignores at least three early works. On page 11 Professor White falls into a series of errors—"Croly" is not a part of the title of the book, the date is 1828, not 1831, and the passage quoted from Croly's *Beauties of the English Poets* touching the continued dominance of Pope in the Age of Romanticism is misquoted and therefore misinterpreted. Croly merely meant that of the poets immediately succeeding Dryden, "Pope retains the pre-eminence," but the word *still* which has unfortunately slipped in just before

the word *retains* gives a contemporaneousness to the idea which Mr. Croly never meant, as is shown by his later strictures on Pope and his praise of the Romantics. On page 45 he is tripped up again in interpretation when he asserts that "*The Refutation* [of *Deism*] itself is an example of Shelley's peculiar methods at the time, for its real aim, of course, is to support deism." On the contrary *A Refutation* is a vigorous plea for atheism as the only course between Christianity and Deism.

But let us repeat that *The Unextinguished Hearth* is a valuable repository and will prove a time-saver to Shelley scholars.

DAVID LEE CLARK

The University of Texas

BRIEF MENTION

Deutscher Sprachatlas, fortgesetzt von WALTHER MITZKA und BERNHARD MARTIN. 9. Lieferung. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937. The maps of the ninth number of the *Sprachatlas* have a new appearance in so far as some of them show the boundary lines as well as the distinguishing dialect marks in color, and one (Nr. 56, Wrede's 'Einteilungskarte') has deeply hatched boundaries. The value of the color marks lies especially in the fact that it is possible to dispense with a large number of diacritical signs, thereby making the maps easier to study where more involved linguistic factors are treated. Owing to mechanical difficulties in connection with the colors, the so-called 'Pausblätter' disappear entirely and cannot even be got separately, as in the case of the former numbers. This ninth number is also significant in that it gives together with Wrede's map of the above-mentioned classification of the German dialects, which he used with alterations and additions from 1903 on for his lectures, a brief and usable descriptive table in the 'Text,' pages 247 to 254, the detailed commentary is to appear in the *Deutsche Dialektgeographie* series. The present number, however, is principally concerned with the geographical distribution of forms of the words *erzählt* in sentence 21 ('Wem hat er die neue Geschichte erzählt?') and *trinken* in sentence 16 ('Du bist noch nicht gross genug, um eine Flasche Wein auszutrinken . . .')—interesting is the observation that the Swabian dialects still mark the difference between an infinitive (MHG *-en*) and a gerund (MHG *-ende*)—and briefly discusses the various words used in the different dialects for *sprechen* in sentence 31 ('Ich verstehe euch nicht, ihr musst ein bisschen lauter sprechen.'). We are here confronted with the problem of the 'Gefühlston,'

which plays such a large part in semasiology. The editors properly remark that "Die Voistellung kann ja die verschiedensten Menschenarten umfassen der Fragende kann als schweihoriger Alter, oder der Gemahnte als ungezogenes Kind gedacht werden. Diese Wortkarte zeigt also die Grenzen der schriftlichen Fragenmethode überhaupt. Aber auch bei unmittelbarer Frage wurde sich die Gefahr ganz verschiedener Bedeutungsinhalte höchstens verringern lassen." Many other facts presented in the objective way of the *Sprachatlas* offer new problems and assist in solving old ones.

EDWARD H. SEHRT

George Washington University

Carlyle's Fusion of Poetry, History, and Religion by 1834. By HILL SHINE. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp viii + 85. \$1.50. This little volume brings together three articles which appeared in *Studies in Philology* during 1936 and 1937. The development of Carlyle's conceptions of religion, poetry, and history is traced to the point of their fusion in 1834. The author goes into the matter with great care and succeeds in combining a series of very complicated intellectual and spiritual struggles into a unity that is convincing. Without over-quotation he allows Carlyle to speak very largely for himself.

Briefly the conflict in Carlyle's mind began as soon as he tried to accommodate his early and narrow religious training to ampler ranges of thought. Beginning with "a profound distrust" of reason he attained under the influence of German philosophy a favorable conception and a new definition of the faculty so that by 1829 he came to look upon it as "the unifier of religion and poetry." By the end of 1831 he had achieved a theoretical fusion of religion and poetry from which he anticipated "a new tolerant morality." Early in 1832 he reached the belief that poetry "in very deed" had "nothing to do with Fiction." The conflict of man's free will with material necessity "not only is Poetry, but is the sole Poetry possible." For him history and poetry had now become one.

Thus he attained a theoretical fusion of the three. "Poetry, Carlyle insisted, should find its materials in facts rather than in fiction. History, the manifestation of the supernatural in the actual, was to serve as exempla to society. Religion, also a manifestation of the supernatural in the actual, was to provide the highest moral interpretation of these phenomena of life." In 1834 he wrote to Emerson that *The Diamond Necklace* was his first attempt to unify history and poetry. It was really more than this, as we have seen. It was a fusion of both with religion. Thus *The Diamond Necklace* was the prelude to *The French Revolution*, which Carlyle began twenty days after writing to Emerson the letter just mentioned. Difficult as it is to follow the mazes of a mind like

Carlyle's there can be little doubt that Mr Shine has brought into relief the main conclusions of Carlyle's thinking on these subjects, and that he has given as much perhaps as we shall ever know about the matter.

WALDO H. DUNN

Scripps College

Arthur Rimbaud in Abyssinia Par ENID STARKIE Oxford Clarendon Press [New York Oxford University Press], 1937 Pp. viii + 158. The poet Rimbaud remained eleven years in Abyssinia (1880-91), but he wrote not one line of poetry during all this time—indeed we know well that he turned his back deliberately on his early life, spoke of it with scorn. One is not surprised, therefore, to find that this book—conscientiously written—in its 158 pages of small print, should contain much that concerns the history of Abyssinia, some pages concerning Rimbaud's activity as a merchant and explorer, nothing at all concerning the latter's poetry. The author believes that even so there might be something to glean retrospectively regarding the poet. . . This is difficult to deny positively, but very few hints are offered. The last chapter telling of the failure of Rimbaud's sturdy efforts to gain a real foothold in Abyssinia, of his return to Europe, of his last terrible illness, of his death in Marseilles, is moving, and shows that Rimbaud was perhaps not as fundamentally corrupt as posterity thinks (he was good to slaves and stood for their rights against brutal masters). One thing may be relevant. Rimbaud would not have been opposed to use his pen—if not for poetry or least as a prose writer—in his last years, but his attempts to get in touch with the Société Géographique came to naught. The reader may judge for himself how much this study concerns literature—where does the domain of literature not extend to-day!?

A. SCHINZ

The University of Pennsylvania

Le Comédien Auvergnat Montdory, introducteur et interprète de Corneille Par ELIE COTTIER. Clermont-Ferrand: Imprimeries Mont-Louis, 1937. Pp. 267. Written by a journalist of Clermont-Ferrand who is in close touch with recent scholarly productions, this book gives a lively account of the first great French actor. It is attractively illustrated and introduced by a laudatory letter from M. Strowski. While there is little in the volume that was not known to a few specialists, there is in it for many readers information, agreeably presented, in regard to the actors who made possible the rise in France of classical drama, as well as an entertaining account of life in central France in the second quarter of the seventeenth

century and a sympathetic biography of an actor who attained great fame only to see his chances for further triumphs taken away by paralysis

H. C. L.

John Milton Paradise Lost. Paradise Regained, the Minor Poems, and Samson Agonistes. Edited by MERRITT Y. HUGHES. New York Doubleday, Doan & Co., 1935, 1937 Pp lvi + 412, lxiii + 633 \$1.00 per volume This two-volume edition of Milton's poetry, together with a forthcoming volume of selected prose, is avowedly "not intended primarily for scholars." Its introductions, however, draw upon very recent scholarship as well as upon the inevitable sources, and its notes are not only full but also (at this late date) surprisingly fresh A provocative feature is the arrangement of the minor poems in chronological order—a comparatively new idea, always dangerous, but demonstrably valuable. There are an interesting number of differences from the chronology of Grierson (1925), and even from that of Hanford (1936). Professor Hughes has succeeded in producing an edition which his colleagues may profitably consult, and which those students who are not distracted by footnotes will find enlightening indeed.

The Ohio State University

WILLIAM R. PARKER

Elijah Fenton 1688-1730. By EARL HARLAN Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1937. Pp 205 This useful study of Fenton's character, career and achievement is strictly objective, and deals judiciously with a number of difficult points. The author proves, for example, that Fenton was from his Cambridge days "a merely political non-juror," dispels much of the obscurity surrounding the poet's early maturity, pushes the composition of *Mariamne* back to the fall of 1711, and establishes the Fenton canon In the *Odyssey* collaboration, which is here approached from a new direction, Fenton stands out as the most honest triumvir, but Pope comes off well, always generous to Fenton and astonishingly patient in the midst of harassments. Pope seems to have revised Fenton's translations less thoroughly than has been supposed, though on this point the evidence is not conclusive.

Fenton was so apathetic physically and intellectually that he is not likely to win another biographer, and this one is scarcely to be blamed if his book is of interest only to the specialist But Dr. Harlan could have lightened the reader's task by permitting some of the detailed discussion (on pp. 56-57, for example) to overflow into the notes, and by providing summaries more frequently at chapter ends He is completely candid about Fenton's essential unimportance as a person and as a poet, emphasizing the "typical aspects" of career and achievements Here one might expect a

more minute examination of Fenton's blank verse, and of the "progress poem" element in *An Epistle to Mr. Southerne*

ROBERT A. AUBIN

New Jersey College for Women

A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715) Volume II, 1708-1715 By WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN. Bloomington, Indiana. \$6 00 (Indiana University Studies, Nos 114-118, 100 copies for sale) The second volume of Professor Morgan's bibliography will be welcomed by those familiar with the first volume. In a period in which literature and journalism were so closely allied, the student of literature is frequently forced to devote some time to the controversial pamphleteering of the age Professor Morgan's volumes will be indispensable for such work The second volume lists about 5,700 items for eight years The third volume, which "will include chapters on source materials later than 1716, correspondence, the drama, periodicals, secondary works, and unpublished manuscripts," is expected from the press in a few months.

LOUIS I BREDVOLD

University of Michigan

Heinrich Arman Rattermann, German American Author, Poet and Historian, 1832-1923. By Sister MARY EDMUND SPANHEIMER (The Catholic University of America Studies in German, vol. ix.) Washington, 1937. Pp x, 148 A thorough and sympathetic study of the idealistic and fruitful career of Rattermann that will appeal to every student of the Germans in America The author divides the work into three parts of approximately equal length. The first deals with the German immigrant who settled in Cincinnati in 1846 and rose to comfortable wealth through founding an insurance company The second analyzes his poetry, which was inspired chiefly by Herder, Goethe, Platen, and Geibel—far removed from both Romanticism or Naturalism. Rattermann, among many other things, wrote over 600 sonnets, some of them full of great beauty. His other, probably his chief merit, lies in the field of the history of the Germans in this country, where his vast, carefully documented output constitutes interesting reading and fundamental source material. After his death his library was acquired by the University of Illinois He was born a Catholic and preserved throughout his life a reverent, though not a believing, attitude toward the Church. Some of the author's quotations are not rendered into felicitous English in the notes (e. g. pp. 39 and 112). There is an excellent bibliography.

A. E. ZUCKER

University of Maryland

Johann Nestroy Ausgewählte Werke. Herausgegeben und eingeleitet von FRANZ H. MAUTNER. Mit 8 farbigen Tafeln und 1 Bildnis des Dichters. Wien Otto Lorenz Verlag 494 S. So groß der Erfolg Nestroys zu Lebzeiten war—im Jahre 1844 wurden in Wien 170 Aufführungen seiner Werke gegeben—so schwer haben es ihm die Kritiker schon damals und die Literaturhistoriker später gemacht, denn Mephisto ist immer eine peinliche Erscheinung, die Märchenwelt Raimunds ist bequemer und gemutvoller. Dazu ist er schwer einzuordnen, teilweise steckt er noch im Biedermeier, teilweise berührt er sich mit dem Rationalismus des Jungen Deutschlands und seine Wurzeln stecken im Barock und in der Aufklärung zugleich. Es paßt das Kellersche Sonett "Jeder Schem trugt" auf ihn, nur daß es Nestroy nicht gelingt, jenen Schatz in dem verdächtigen Hause zu heben und so wie der Schweizer sich zu versöhnendem Humor durchzuringen.

Mautner hat auf 60 Seiten seiner Ausgabe einen Aufsatz vorausgeschickt, der über Nestroy als Dichter und Schauspieler nicht nur berichtet, sondern der mit geschickten Analysen an den gegebenen Werken aufzeigt, wo mimisch, dramatisch und wortschöpferisch seine Stärke liegt. Da die deutsche Literatur an Komodien nicht reich ist, liegt die Wertung Nestroys als großen Komodiendichters nahe, wenn sie auch trotz der Wärme und des Geschickes, mit dem sich der Herausgeber für ihn einsetzt, kaum ohne Widerspruch bleiben wird.

Die acht gut gewählten Stücke, denen eine gute Blütenlese von Glanzstellen und Aphorismen aus andern Werken, drei Musikproben und ein Glossar österreichischer Dialektworte angefügt sind, basiert textlich auf der großen Brunkner-Rommelschen Nestroy-Ausgabe. Gut gedruckt und mit 8 vorzüglichen farbigen Tafeln Nestroyscher Rollen ausgestattet, reiht sie sich den gangigen Klassikerausgaben würdig an.

ERNST FEISE

The Complete Works of John Webster. Edited by F. L. LUCAS. New York Oxford University Press, 1937. 4 vols., pp xviii + 288, vi + 372, vi + 339, viii + 274. \$10.50 This is a reprint of the edition published by Houghton Mifflin in 1928 and reviewed in *MLN* (xlv, 56-60). In reprinting this excellent edition at a substantial reduction in price, the Oxford Press has done much to realize the editor's desire "to get Webster enjoyed" by the general reader.

LOUIS TEETER

The Johns Hopkins University

CORRESPONDENCE

ZÈBRE Un savant portugais, M Merêa, avait identifié (*Rev lus* xxv, 284) un nom d'animal *zevno*, *ezabra* etc se trouvant dans d'anciens documents de son pays, avec l'onagre, une sorte d'âne sauvage M A Castro dans la *RFE* xv, 17 avait repris cette identification pour l'a esp *zebro*, *enzebra*, *azebro*, *ezebro* et ajouté que le *zebre* importé plus récemment d'Afrique par les Portugais, avait été dénommé par ceux-ci par le nom de l'onagre dont la race avait disparu de la péninsule, mais dont la légendaire course rapide rappelait celle de l'onagre, quant à l'étymologie, M Castro ne pouvait rien affirmer sinon qu'il excluait une étymologie arabe, vu la diffusion du nom de l'onagre dans les noms de lieux J'ai pu ajouter (*RFE* xv, 375) des textes catalans du XV^e siècle attestant le même nom de la bête ancienne (*corrents atzebres*, *mes corre qu'enzebra*) et j'ai ajouté (*Neuphil Mitt* xxxvii, 94) un anc prov *sibra* (dans *Flamenca* v 4291 *El mon non a drago ni vibra / ors ni leon ni lop ni sibra / qu'om no l pusca adomeschar*) et un anc fr (*Rom de Thèbes* v 4775) *azouvre* (*plus tost vont qu'oiseaus qui vole*), pour l'étymologie, je discutais la suggestion de Marineus Siculus (XVI^e siècle) et Covarrubias (mentionnée par Castro) les zèbres seraient ces poulains lusitains engendrés par le zephyre d'après le dire d'Homère, de Virgile et de Pline (cf galic *véfiro* 'wind egg,' all *Winder*), mais je ne pouvais pleinement y souscrire à cause des *a-en-* des mots péninsulaires anciens je proposais dubitativement *insipidus* 'rétif' M Menéndez Pidal revient dans un article "Zebra, cebra" de *Rom Review* xxix, 74, sur la question étymologique et, sans connaître mon article qui avait paru pendant les troubles espagnols, s'arrête à *zéphyrus*. *zebra* serait, en harmonie avec la légende, une forme portugaise, sans diphthongaison "el nombre fué ideado en Lusitania y de allí se difundió por toda la Península", M Pidal prouve ensuite que les idiomes africains ne montrent aucune trace d'un mot indigène qui pourrait avoir donné le nom du zèbre aux langues européennes, de sorte que cet animal doit bien son nom à l'onagre ancien Le brillant exposé de M Menendez Pidal, qui révèle son impeccable maîtrise de la philologie et de la linguistique, ne nous dispense pourtant pas des questions suivantes (1) le prov *sibra* (en rime avec le latinisme *vibra* = *vīpera*) et l'a fr *azouvre* (celui-ci moins sûr) ne concordent pas avec *é* latin, (2) les formes avec *e(n)-a-* ne sont pas éclaircies par *zephyrus* faudrait-il expliquer l'*a-* par un emprunt à travers l'arabe (cat *atzebra* comme *atzémla*, a esp *azémila* = ar *az-zémila* avec article assimilé), puis 'hypostase de préfixe' *a->en-*?

LEO SPITZER

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIV

FEBRUARY, 1939

Number 2

JAQUES, AND THE ANTIQUARIES

"Since 1905," says Professor O J Campbell in the first sentence of his article¹ on the character in answer to mine, "most competent critics have regarded Jaques as that type of melancholy man which the Elizabethans called 'malcontent.'" For full thirty years to have been paid such homage and never known of it, and then, in the third sentence, have it taken away! "The author of the present essay believes this to be a mistaken view." A Christopher Sly, then, but with the no very sizable grandeur entirely in retrospect! Yet, if I ever really had it, why must I be deprived of it by a scholarly procedure such as this? I mean the disturbing intrusion of antiquarian learning into the interpretation of Shakespeare's characters, the substitution of an Elizabethan textbook physiology or psychology for our contemporary sort. That is what I cannot bear. Like the executioner to be executed, I am particular about the technique. On the question whether Jaques really resembles Marston's Malevole, Timothy Bright of 1586 or Robert Burton of 1621 can have little more to say, I think, than Freud or Jung.

The word *malcontent*, says Mr Campbell, was loosely used by the Elizabethans and no malcontent *type* was recognized. Quite true, and if I ever expressed a contrary opinion I was mistaken to be sure. But that does not mean the word may not serve for a convenient label (as employed in the title and repeatedly, yet not loosely at all, in the text of the *Malcontent* of Marston) attached to a distinctly delineated stage figure recognizably reproduced by others of the School and similar to that in *As You Like It*. In

¹ *Huntington Library Bulletin*, October, 1935. The article referred to is "Shakespeare, Marston and the Malcontent Type," *MP*, III (1905-6), 281-303.

one paragraph of 17 lines, which Mr. Campbell quotes on p. 72, I indicated a few (not all) of the numerous points of external resemblance. Some of these, I may say in passing, Mr. Campbell thinks "may be questioned" but he doesn't really question any of them, insisting only on matters which, as I thought, I had taken account of—that Malevole is feigning while Jaques is not and Malevole is a "blacker cynic." The fundamental objection which Mr. Campbell raises is not the want of resemblance but the fact that there is no medical diagnosis furnished. By the dramatist, that is to say; and the point would seem to be that to all appearances Jaques is like Malevole but at bottom isn't. Externals here will not do. "Jaques would much more easily be recognized as a type by an Elizabethan audience if he were presented as suffering from one of the carefully differentiated forms of melancholy described in the medical treatises of the age." For this, following the lead of Miss Lily Campbell, to whom he acknowledges great indebtedness, the critic provides. One would think the dramatist himself would have made it easier for his audience. No blame, however, is fastened on him, and yet in view of "the convincing evidence that Miss Lily B. Campbell² has presented to prove that Hamlet is an accurately conceived type of the sanguine adust temperament," Shakespeare by 1600 must have been "familiar with the standard analysis of melancholy. Hence it should not prove wasted labor to discover whether Jaques is a figure drawn closely upon a scientifically accurate model."

Distinguishing, then, melancholy "natural" and "unnatural" Mr. Campbell after consideration of the symptoms—sluggishness, terrors, hallucinations—determines that Jaques is not suffering from any form of the "natural." Of the "unnatural" not so much can be said. This sort is produced by "adustion," and Jaques suffers from "melancholy formed by adustion," or burning. The symptoms are emotional instability, lively wit, figurative and sententious utterance, solitariness, madness at the worst. Also, because of his interest in water—weeping by "the brook that brawls along this wood"—Jaques is "a phlegmatic person of some sort. . . . A character who was introduced to an Elizabethan audience poring over a brook and there weeping and meditating, would write himself down at once as a phlegmatic person who had

² *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes Slaves of Passion* (1930).

been rendered melancholy." To cut the matter short (as for fear of blundering or boring I am eager to do) Jaques' case is "the unnatural melancholy produced [though some authorities doubted the possibility of this sort of burning!] by adustion of phlegm."

After that I wonder that the critic does not proceed to prove Malevole of "the sanguine adust," or something as remote, and so settle the business between him and me for good and all. But the Malcontent he has forgotten, and me as well, and almost Jaques too as a human or a tragic figure. He does make sensible remarks about identifications, and happily will not hear of Jaques as Jonson or Marston or Sir John Harington. He also appreciates him rightly and aptly as a comic but not a ridiculous figure, and yet bears in mind that he is not quite sympathetically treated, either, but is a disillusioned "libertine." With that, however, the antiquarian in him again gets uppermost, and the Duke's (and Shakespeare's) way of putting it is not sufficiently "scientific." "This cynicism of an exhausted roué . . . has been the agent of the adustion of his phlegmatic nature, the cause of his psychosis" (p. 93). As one himself half Scotch, remembering the qualities of Burns and Barrie and ignoring Lamb's opinion to the contrary, I am disinclined to think that Mr. Campbell is wanting in a sense of humour. Here he is in the throes of research or the first flush of discovery.

It isn't the language merely, but the ideas, their disturbing intrusion! Why should spectator or reader, or Shakespeare either, be burdened with such lumber when all three understand a played-out "libertine" "chiding sin" perfectly well without it? It is possible that for some Elizabethan spectators a character poring over a book, and there weeping and meditating, would at once write himself down as a phlegmatic person who had been rendered melancholy; but for an audience it is not possible that he would. So some few in the house today might "at once" analyse him in the jargon of Freud or Jung. But neither is or was the effect desired by dramatist or poet. He would be as much disconcerted as Heine was when on his giving a young lady a wild flower and on her mother's asking for its name their hitherto silent companion counted the stamens and declared, *ganz trocken*, "It belongs to the eighth class." "As the phlegmatic partie dreameth commonly of rivers of water, and the choleric of flaming fire," quoth Mr Campbell's Elizabethan Laurentius—in poetry or in reality, either, were Elizabethans and Jacobeans who pensively gazed at the brook or into

the grate at once written down for either phlegmatic or choleric because of it? The superfluous psychologizing and physiologizing of poetry and drama casts a blight upon both

Not much damage is done in the article before us. Mr. Campbell fails, indeed, to realize that while in life it is well to remember "Things are seldom what they seem," it is not so well for the spectator or critic at the theatre, and that only with appearances drama or other art has to do unless (and until) those appearances are penetrated in the work of art itself. His detective activity, however, is so much in the background that it does not upset the story or distort the features of the dreamy cynic. It is otherwise when a great hero like Hamlet, who fills the play, is in question, and the key to his character and the story is carelessly left in a book, not considerably put into the spectator's hand. Miss Campbell is not only a detective but a reformer. She goes farther than Miss O'Sullivan in 1926 with Hamlet,³ and farther than her clansman with Jaques, expecting of Shakespeare's audience, without any of the guidance furnished by Jonson's or Marston's *raisonneurs*, that they should then and there, out of the abundance of their own knowledge, recognize and distinguish not only "natural" humours but the "unnatural," not only the simple but the "compound." The Prince is "naturally sanguine" but "unnaturally melancholy," and "his melancholy is inevitably the sanguine adust" (p. 113). The audience must look sharp, therefore, and perpend. With no helpful reference or allusion to Timothy Bright, whose book it was, Hamlet's particular and formidable variety of the disease is plainly and "inevitably" the cause of his aversion to action. The very centre and pivot of the plot, the core of the character, is not in the play. Even had Shakespeare himself read and pondered the book would he have left the explanation out? It is not merely that this method is difficult and exacting. It is not dramatic or poetic; it is not imaginative or emotional, as drama and poetry should be. The passions, indeed, Miss Campbell frowns upon. Her Shakespearean heroes—even in her title they are "passion's slaves" "Excessive grief," from the beginning, has brought Hamlet to this dire pass of the "sanguine adust", and it "renders him dull [alas, poor Hamlet! I knew him, Herr Kollege!] and makes him guilty of the sin of sloth" (p. 115). (A slothful character would do in a

³ Cf. my *Shakespeare Studies* (1927), p. 146

satirical comedy, but even there, without some added means of acceleration, hardly in the leading rôle.) "It is that wicked grief which refuses to be consoled" (p 132)—what of Orestes and Electra, then, what of tragedy?—and the guilty King and Queen in their counsels to the hero on their first appearance after their unholy marriage, they have the correct ethical position

In Shakespeare and other Elizabethan drama there are, to be sure, ideas and sentiments, slightly technical terms and phrases which ordinarily needed no explanation then though they somewhat need it now. There are the terms "humours," "spirits," and "complexion," "dry brain" or "hot liver," "blood-constringing sighs" or "the precious square of sense." Or there are phrases like Lady Macbeth's "That I may pour my spirits in thine ear," which conveyed a sufficient meaning into the ear of the groundling then as it does today, though not the full meaning of a "transfusion of soul." But such momentary, verbal or phrasal matters, perfectly intelligible or not, are a different thing from an Elizabethan physiologist-psychologist's framework, upon which the character is "accurately modelled", or from a scholastic scheme of a virtue, upon which the plot is modelled. Not only is Lear not an habitually angry man, as Miss Campbell would have him (so, like Hamlet he would be robbed of our respect and sympathy); his story itself also is not a demonstration of the Elizabethan or ancient technical definition of justice, in all the seven sub-divisions, as another investigator of the school would have it. In so far as the story really is such, the Elizabethan text-book definition squares with the human and universal conception, which does not require statement. Lear is not a criminal offender, either, or again he would be robbed of our respect and sympathy. And when in *Hamlet* the dramatist is actually psychologizing a little after the Elizabethan technical fashion—as in Ophelia's report of Hamlet's visit or in the hero's own account of his condition to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern—he makes the matter almost as plain and acceptable to an open-minded reader who has observed his dramatic method here and elsewhere as to the seasoned playgoer at the Globe.

To Miss Campbell and Mr. Campbell all this may betray a "blindness to ideal values," which is Mr. Campbell's phrase elsewhere. But if the moral values are meant, why, is it not a blindness to the noble and illustrious qualities of Romeo and Hamlet, Lear and Othello, this turning of the heroes into "slaves" and their passions

into "deadly sins"? So the *critic* becomes a malcontent, a "blackier cynic" than Malevole. Or if the higher esthetic values are meant, is it not a blindness to poetry, this making more of the humours than the dramatist himself does and reducing a character or a plot to the proportions and vitality of a text-book scheme?

The Campbells, thus standing or hanging together, are alas! by no means alone. Others than her fellow clansman have praised the lady, and emulated her, and that's the reason I have had to say so much of her. Her influence upon American Elizabethans is unmistakable — of her vogue she cannot be unaware and much of it indeed she merits. But in the very conception of the nature of tragedy, I think, she is in error, or else the study of tragedy might well be abandoned, and she is equally so in her method of applying antiquarian lore, whether her initial conception is right or wrong.⁴ Yet who of us scholars (if we deserve the name) has not in one way or another been so too? All we like sheep—after their leader—have gone astray, often with far less of learning and acumen than the redoubtable Caledonian pair to justify us. In Elizabethan drama it used to be recent contemporary philosophy and psychology. now it is the Elizabethan. Or it is topical or personal allusions, or else sources or influences, or else a kind of historical sociology, or else (worst of all) it is a notion that the play (not merely a character) is by no means what it appears to be and must be made over into what it is. Most criticism is of little value—and less pleasure—to any but the writer himself, and that is truer in the field of Elizabethan drama (Shakespeare, of course, above all) than in any other. Much learning hath—no, not *that* has brought us to the above-mentioned extremest consequence of "unnatural melancholy, adust," for who even though a scholar ever had too much of *that*? But we have failed to keep it in its place. We have failed to remember that criticism is not history or science but an art, and not that of detecting or "reconditioning," either, but the simple though seldom successful art of reading and responding, both analyzing and judging as we do it.

Too simple and humble for a fair number, at least among the learned. Not only writers but some sturdy and resolute readers prefer to the analytic and impressionistic criticism this that is,

⁴ This subject of antiquarian criticism I have touched upon in an article on "Recent Shakespeare Criticism," *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1938, and more fully in my forthcoming *Shakespeare and Other Masters*

however wrongly, called the historical. This is scholarship, no belletristic trifling, and they grit their teeth. They like its solidity, they say; they are impressed by the paraphernalia and manoeuvres of research, they are imposed upon by the signature of sophistication. Taking their fiction in the guise of biography, as in *Ariel*, they are ready to take their criticism in the guise of history. It is natural to like what is true, or even what pretends to be. Or if detective stories are their choice, detection and history can easily be combined. How much better or more edifying a mystery in one or all of the 37 glorious plays than in the Rue Morgue or Halstead Street! Especially for the detective himself, who, without being quite aware, has both cleared it up and created it!

The two scholars whom I have been discussing, of course, are above that sort of legerdemain. But there is a good deal of it in historical criticism (particularly that of Shakespeare) whether it cares to pass under that name or not, and the criticism of the two shares the historical glamour and prestige.

ELMER EDGAR STOLL

University of Minnesota

ROMEO AND JULIET FURTHER RESTORED

Nearly all editors of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* agree that Q_1 of that play (that of John Danter dated 1597) is not printed from an authoritative manuscript—rather it is a “surreptitious” and imperfect copy. Many critics feel that its imperfections are due to its having been patched up from what “traitor” actors who had played in Shakespeare's company could remember of it, though the theory that it was taken down in shorthand by a spectator at one or more of the performances of Shakespeare's company is also widely held. In any case, there seems to be no doubt that at least one other mind has often intervened between Shakespeare's text and that of Q_1 .¹ It is obvious, therefore, that Q_1 should be resorted to only when Q_2 , the “good” quarto,² is

¹ The general opinion of Q_1 is well expressed by the Cambridge editors (Preface, p. viii): “It is impossible that Shakespeare should ever have given to the world a composition containing so many instances of imperfect sense, halting metre, bad grammar, and abrupt dialogue.”

² The later quartos and folios were derived from Q_2 .

unintelligible.³ To take a Q_1 reading merely because it is slightly smoother metrically or because we like it better than a Q_2 reading which makes good sense is probably to allow the men who made the "bad" quarto from memory or from shorthand notes to revise Shakespeare. Yet this is often done, in modern⁴ as well as in the older editions of *Romeo and Juliet*. A few examples follow.

In I, iv, 100-103 of Q_2 Mercutio calls "vaine phantasie"

more inconstant then the wind who wooes
Euen now the frozen bosome of the North,
And being angerd puffs away from thence,
Turning his side to the dewe dropping South

Instead of *side* in the last line, modern editions have *face*, this having first been inserted from Q_1 by Pope. But *side* is a good reading; in fact, it is preferable to *face*. For, according to the *NED*, Elizabethans often used *side* like *loins*, "with reference to generation or birth."⁵ Mention has just been made of the wind's wooing the frozen bosom of the North, and for this same wind merely to look at a second mistress would be anticlimactic. Moreover, *side* is a conventionally poetic word, particularly in key with a passage like this.⁶

³In his preface to the facsimile of Q_1 edited by Charles Praetorius (London, 1886), Herbert A. Evans says (p. xv) "The value of Q_1 is simply that of a check upon Q_2 . . . We may turn to it for help when the standard edition fails us."

⁴The modern editions consulted are those of H. N. Hudson (re-issued as the Harvard edition), W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright (Cambridge and Globe), H. H. Furness (New Variorum), W. J. Rolfe, I. Gollancz (Temple), E. Dowden ([English] Arden), W. A. Neilson (*Works*), W. H. Durham (Yale), and G. L. Kittredge (*Works*).

In making reference to specific passages, Furness's division into acts, scenes, and lines is followed throughout.

⁵I Kings 8:19 "thy son shall come forth of thy loins." *Side*, too, in this sense is often found in the plural, but could be used in the singular, as in the epilogue to Milton's *Comus*.

"And from her fair unspotted side
Two blissful twins are to be born."

And in Dryden's *Amphitryon*, II, ii, 27-29, are the lines

"Come back, my lord, in faith you shall retire,
You have not yet lain long enough in bed,
To warm your widowed side."

⁶In addition to the poetic uses of the word given in note 5 above,

In I, III, 64-71 of Q₂ are the following lines ·

"Old La tell me daughter *Juliet*,
 How stands your dispositions to be married
Juliet It is an houre that I dreame not of
Nurse An houre, were not I thine onely Nurse I would say thou
 hadst suckt wisdom from thy teate"⁷
Old La Well thinke of marriage now, yonger then you
 Here in Verona, Ladies of esteeme,
 Are made alreadie mothers"

Modern editors, again following Pope, replace *hour* in Juliet's and the Nurse's speeches by *honor* from Q₁. *Hour*, however, is a good reading. In the first place, *hour* is often disyllabic in Shakespeare, and therefore fits into the blank verse here.⁸ Secondly, Lady Capulet's rejoinder, "Well, think of marriage *now*," followed by her observation that many ladies of Verona younger than Juliet are already married, makes it seem certain that Juliet has said *hour*. For this speech is an answer to Juliet's implied objection that she is too young for marriage, an objection that is not indicated by the honor reading.⁹

The interjection of the Nurse, in which she repeats the word in question and adds a comment, remains to be considered. If the Nurse were here merely praising Juliet for having the proper attitude toward marriage, the *honor* reading would (as far as this

observe the following William Dunbar, *Ros Mary Ane Ballat of our Lady*, line 41 "Thy blissit sydis bure the campioun" Shelley, Dedication to *The Revolt of Islam*, line 77 "And from thy side two gentle babes are born" Schmidt gives the above-mentioned meaning of *side* in his *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, but says nothing of Mercutio's use of the word. Schmidt thinks that "Tarquin's ravishing sides" of *Macbeth*, II, I, 55, should not be emended to read "Tarquin's ravishing strides," as it is in modern editions

Dowden observes that *side* may be the preferable reading in the last line of Mercutio's speech. He prints *face*, however

⁷ The italicization of the Nurse's speeches in this scene has not been satisfactorily explained. It occurs, together with mislining, both in Q₂ and in Q₄.

⁸ *As You Like It*, II, VII, 33 "An hour by his dial O noble fool!" *Twelfth Night*, V, I, 226 "How have the hours rack'd and tortur'd me" *Hamlet*, I, IV, 3 "What hour now? I think it lacks of twelve" There are many other examples scattered throughout the plays

⁹ It is perhaps significant that this part of Lady Capulet's speech is omitted in Q₄.

line is concerned) be acceptable. But the observation that a child had sucked knowledge from the teat was a commendation of the child's *precocity*,¹⁰ and the word *honor* was surely not unusual enough for the Nurse to consider its use by Juliet precocious.¹¹ The *hour* reading, at any rate, makes the speech consonant with the Nurse's character. She apparently takes *hour* to be a reference to the time of the consummation of a marriage, and her roguish cry that Juliet is surprisingly sophisticated to think of such an hour is in keeping with her long speech immediately preceding, in which she has exclaimed again and again over the child's earlier wisdom about the facts of sex.

Before replacing a Q_2 reading that has meaning by a Q_1 reading, editors should remember that each word offered the makers of Q_1 excellent opportunities to make an error. In this case, for instance, the "thief" may have misunderstood—may have thought that *hour* was *honor*, especially since *hour* would have been disyllabic here. Even though he heard the word correctly, he may have forgotten it when he came to write it down, or have incorrectly filled in a gap in his shorthand which lack of time or the danger of detection had made necessary. Finally, even if he wrote it down without error, the printer may have misread his writing. It is true that Q_2 cannot be trusted implicitly. Its typesetter may have had to rely on a playhouse transcription rather than on Shakespeare's own MS., and there is evidence that parts of it were set up from corrected sheets of Q_1 . But from the two greatest sources of error just mentioned, faulty hearing and faulty memory, it is, of course, free.

In II, iv, 14 of Q_2 Mercutio says of Romeo:

Alas poore *Romeo*, he is alreadie dead stabd with a white wenches blacke eye, runne through the eare with a Loue song, the very pinne of his heart, cleft with the blind Bowe-boyes but-shaft, and is hee a man to encounter *Tybalt*?

Nearly all modern editors, following Capell, replace *run through*

¹⁰ A similar expression is found in Massinger's *Unnatural Combat*, I, i, where the usher praises the wit of a page by saying, "I think they suck this knowledge with their milk." And the page replies, "I had an ignorant nurse else."

¹¹ Steevens, however, felt that *honor* "was likely to strike the old ignorant woman, as a very elegant and discreet word for the occasion." Steevens' note is quoted by Malone.

swear is very often (five times) used in the next eight lines.¹⁶ And, to repeat, even though the two words are equally agreeable to our ears, the Q_2 reading should be retained. It should be retained, indeed, if it makes sense or did in Shakespeare's time, no matter how much we prefer the other reading.¹⁷ As a matter of fact, our

¹⁶ The last argument given in the case just cited applies here, too. A typesetter following a MS is not likely to think *swear* is *vow*, but a person writing the passage from memory is very likely to make the opposite error.

¹⁷ Samuel Johnson's words à propos of his having restored *hugger mugger* to the text of *Hamlet*, instead of the emendation *in private* of contemporary editions, are applicable. "That the words now replaced are better, I do not undertake to prove, it is sufficient that they are Shakespeare's."

Other examples follow of Q_2 readings which many modern editors have unnecessarily emended by the substitution of Q_1 readings. In each case the Q_2 reading is given first, followed by the version of modern editors as emended from Q_1 and the names of editors who have returned to the Q_2 version. It will be observed that Neilson and Durham are much more loyal to Q_2 than are the others. In these passages modern spelling and punctuation are used.

I, 1, 183 Q_2 "Love is a smoke made with the fume of sighs"
Modern eds "Love is a smoke rais'd with the fume of sighs"

Neilson and Durham here follow Q_2

I, iv, 58 Q_2 "Over men's noses as they lie asleep"
Modern eds "Athwart men's noses as they lie asleep"

Neilson and Durham here follow Q_2

I, iv, 81. Q_2 "Then he dreams of another benefice"
Modern eds "Then dreams he of another benefice"

Here the Q_2 reading seems decidedly the better, for it emphasizes the *he* by giving it metrical stress. It also achieves variety, as is seen when the line is compared with lines 78 and 83. The Cambridge editors, Neilson, and Durham here follow Q_2 .

I, v, 64. Q_2 . "'A bears him like a portly gentleman"
Modern eds "He beais him like a portly gentleman"

Neilson and Kittredge here follow Q_2

II, iv, 36 Q_2 "Laura to his lady was a kitchen wench"
Modern eds "Laura to his lady was but a kitchen wench"

Neilson and Durham here follow Q_2

II, iv, 147-148 Q_2 "my young lady bid me inquire you out,
what she bid me say, I will keep to myself"
Modern eds "my young lady bade me inquire you out;
what she bade me say I will keep to myself."

According to *NED*, *bād* was a common form for the past tense of the verb in Shakespeare's time. Neilson, Durham, and Kittredge here follow Q_2 .

preference is often the result of habit. If editors had not suppressed the Q_2 readings, most of them would sound as inevitable to us as the insertions from Q_1 do now.¹⁸

The most surprising feature of these departures from Q_2 is that in making them modern editors are, in a majority of cases, following Pope. Apparently Pope's reputation as an editor of Shakes-

III, III, 112-113	Q_2	"Unseemly woman in a seeming man And ill-beseeming beast in seeming both"
Modern eds		"Unseemly woman in a seeming man Or ill-beseeming beast in seeming both"

Dowden, Neilson, and Durham here follow Q_2 .

IV, I, 46	Q_2	"O, Juliet, I already know thy grief"
Modern eds		"Ah, Juliet, I already know thy grief"
IV, I, 81	Q_2	"Or hide me nightly in a charnel house"
Modern eds		"Or shut me nightly in a charnel house"

Durham here follows Q_2

¹⁸ The general observation that Q_1 readings have been adopted oftener than is warranted has been often made. See especially the statements of R. G. White and of the Cambridge editors, both of which are quoted in the Furness Variorum (pp 422, 423). Both White and the Cambridge editors, however, print the Q_1 readings cited in the text above.

Two instances of modern editors' suppressing good readings of Q_2 are in Juliet's epithalamium speech of III, II, a passage omitted in Q_1 . In the first instance, Q_2 makes Juliet say of Romeo (lines 18-19)

"thou wilt lie vpon the winges of night,
Whiter then new snow vpon a Ravens backe"

Kittredge is the only modern editor I have found who does not change the *upon* of the last line to *on*. The emendation first appeared in F_2 . The second instance is in the lines immediately following.

"Come gentle night, come louing black browd night,
Giue me my *Romeo*, and when I shall die,
Take him and cut him out in little starres"

In modern editions "when I shall die" is changed to "when he shall die". This reading first appears in Q_2 , the undated quarto, and, in view of the many evidences of carelessness in this quarto, seems as likely to be an error as an attempt at emendation. For why should Juliet's meaning not be as follows: "If night will give me Romeo to enjoy during my life, I will give him back to her at my death?" (Ulrici, quoted by Furness, makes a similar explanation). It is true that great heroes were usually stellified after their deaths, but Juliet is not thinking of having Romeo treated like Orion. She has in mind the brightness of Romeo's living beauty, and her figure is intended to stress that. Of course, it would be painful to be cut up alive, and this thought has probably influenced the editors. As Samuel Johnson said of another line, however, the idea is philosophical nonsense, but poetic sense.

peare, though at a low ebb, is, nevertheless, still better than it should be. Theobald seems to have left some work still to be done.¹⁹

N. B. ALLEN

University of Delaware

WHAT PURGATIVE DRUG?

In the first extant version of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (the First Folio, 1623) appear the following lines (V, III, 55-6)—lines which the editors of the *NED* cite as the only occurrence of the word *Cyme* (a drug)

What Rubarb, Cyme, or what Purgatiue drugge
Would scowre these English hence

The Second and Third Folios (1632 and 1663 respectively) change *Cyme* to *Cæny*, i e., *Cenie*,¹ a variant of *sene* (*seene*, *seny*, *senie*), from OF. *sené* (*cené*, *senet*), presumably because *Cæny* was the only name of a drug the editors could think of which in any way resembled the First Folio reading. In the Fourth Folio (1685), *Cæny* becomes the more modern *senna*, and this is the reading most Shakespearean editors and commentators have adopted, though not without certain qualms. Keightley, for example, could not help feeling that, in spite of the general acceptance of *senna*, "it may not be the right word."²

In the light of modern scholarship, the emendation *Cenie* is difficult to justify. The textual *m* of *Cyme* may conceivably be explained away as a minim-error, on the part of a transcriber.³

¹⁹ Though Theobald did his work well as far as pointing out the obvious liberties Pope took in making outright emendations of Shakespeare's text is concerned, he was not particularly careful to exercise independent judgment in choosing between the readings of the different quartos. In *Romeo and Juliet* he has silently accepted nearly all of Pope's *Q₁* readings, not only those mentioned in this paper, but many others now universally rejected.

¹ *cæ* is a printer's variant of *e*, *scena*, for example, appears many times in the First Folio as *scæna*. *ie* and *y* interchange in final position, see W. Franz, *Shakespeare-Grammatik* (3rd ed., Heidelberg, 1924), p. 22.

² Thomas Keightley, *The Shakespeare-Expositor* (London, 1867), p. 337.

³ Cf. E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, I, 471. "*Macbeth* is doubtless printed from a prompt-copy."

or compositor, for *m*. Such errors are found elsewhere in Shakespeare⁴. But if such an explanation is accepted, there still remains a textual *y* instead of *e* to be accounted for. To the theory that *y* is a misreading of *e*, the objection may be raised that such errors do not ordinarily appear in lists of misreadings in Shakespearean texts.⁵ Thus there seems to be slight probability, especially when we consider the Elizabethan forms of these letters in internal position, as reproduced in a work like Kellner's *Restoring Shakespeare*, of our having to do with a misreading here. Consequently it becomes necessary, if *Ceme* is to stand, to explain how a *y*, which, when long, ordinarily denoted a diphthong (and had done so since the fifteenth century),⁶ came to be used by Shakespeare to represent the [i]' sound of the stressed vowel of *Ceme*. It is possible, of course, to argue that the letters *i* and *y* were sometimes written for [i] in the Elizabethan period,⁷ but the fact remains that such inverted spellings are contrary to Shakespeare's usual practice.⁸ Thus the odds are unquestionably against *e* as the correct emendation for the *y* of *Cyme*, and thus against the correctness of the present reading.

There is, it seems to me, a more plausible emendation for the First Folio reading. Two of the letters commonly confused by Elizabethan transcribers and compositors were *c* and *t*.¹⁰ J. Dover Wilson gives several examples of misreadings in Shakespeare which have arisen from such confusion,¹¹ and *Cyme*, I suggest, is another

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 179, and J. D. Wilson, *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's "Hamlet"* I, 106-7.

⁵ See Leon Kellner, *Restoring Shakespeare*, p. 31 ff., and Wilson, *op cit.*, I, 106 ff. Wilson's list does include three examples of *y* for *e*, but these are all in final rather than in internal position: *thy* for *the*, *my* for *me*, and *horry* for *hoare*.

⁶ See Franz, *op cit.*, p. 54, and H. C. Wyld, *A History of Modern Colloquial English* (3rd ed., New York, 1937), p. 225.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 205, and Franz, *op cit.*, pp. 48-9.

⁸ Cf. Wyld, *op cit.*, p. 206. *NED* even cites one sixteenth-century example of *sney* for *sene* (but by the Huguenot schoolmaster Claudius Hollyband, or Claude de Sainliens).

⁹ Cf. Franz's discussion of Shakespeare's orthography, *op cit.*, pp. 22-3, where no such practice is mentioned. Cf. also, in the same work, pp. 48-51 and p. 54.

¹⁰ See S. A. Tannenbaum, *The Handwriting of the Renaissance*, pp. 35 and 74.

¹¹ Wilson, *op cit.*, I, 111.

example. Instead of this we should read *Tyme*, a common sixteenth- and seventeenth-century spelling of *thyme*. The fact that *c* is capitalized in the First Folio is of little moment first, because, as Chambers points out, there is "no uniformity anywhere" in the use of capital letters in the quartos and folios of Shakespeare;¹² and secondly, because confusion took place not only between minuscular forms of *t* and *c*, but also between majuscular forms.¹³

Thyme was, of course, well known as a purgative in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The *NED.* cites quotations containing evidence of this from Turner's *Herbal* (1562) and from Langham's *The Garden of Health* (1579). Similar statements are to be found in Thomas Hill, *The Gardeners Labyrinth* (London, 1608), 2nd part, p. 40: "The Tyme . . . purgeth the Choler, and all other humours", and in Nicholas Culpeper, *Pharmacopœia Londinensis* (London, 1654), p. 37 "Tyme . . . purgeth flegm."

With this emendation, *Macbeth*, V, III, 55 reads "What Rubarb, Tyme, or what Purgatue drugge," and thus becomes a normal blank-verse line of ten syllables, in which the stresses fall regularly, the accent in "Purgatue" being, as Van Dam and Stoffel have indicated, on the second syllable.¹⁴

A. R. DUNLAP

University of Delaware

THE KING'S MINISTER IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY FRENCH DRAMA

The seventeenth-century French theater must have observed sufficient caution in portraying king's ministers, it does not appear to have been punished for *lèse excellency*. To suppose, however, that current ministerial activities were unavailable for reproduction on the stage is to grant them an originality which the erudition of

¹² Chambers, *op. cit.*, I, 197-8

¹³ Tannenbaum, *op. cit.*, pp. 98 and 115

¹⁴ B. A. P. van Dam and C. Stoffel, *William Shakespeare, Prosody and Text* (Leyden, 1900), p. 182. The accent in *purgative* normally came, in Shakespeare's time, on the first syllable, but analogy sometimes intervened to shift the stress in trisyllabic *-we* words to the last syllable but one. See Otto Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar*, 4th ed., (Heidelberg, 1928), part I, 5.61 and 5.65

the time disproved. The conjecture overlooks moreover a point of common understanding. Although the literature paid a dubious compliment to ministers in general (and its occasional praise may have sought contemporary marks), the ministers of Louis XIII and the *secrétaires d'État* of Louis XIV were not represented in the overlords

De ces rois nés valets de leurs propres ministres,¹

or the upstarts

Qui changeroient entre eux les simples excellences,
S'ils osoient, en des majestés,²

and the public could be trusted to see in its proper relations the tableau obtained

quand le potentat se laisse gouverner,
Et que de son pouvoir les grands dépositaires
N'ont pour raison d'État que leurs propres affaires³

Nevertheless, various rapprochements between stage and reality have been suggested. The debacle of Aman in Racine's *Esther* has been held a proof of the decline of Louvois in 1689.⁴ Campistron's *Andronic* (the fall of Louvois was not visible in 1685) has been linked to a previous administration.⁵ That is, Campistron and Racine would not have been so daring if Colbert were not dead and Louvois doomed. But it is also said that the drama confined itself to intrigues that did not resemble any local affairs.⁶ Whatever its ingenuity in avoiding or utilizing the political *faits divers* of the day, the theater produced then and there a gallery of ministers of all sorts. The collection might even be called a gang. It contains ministers who drive kings out of power . . . and off the stage. Indeed, a play that bears a monarch's name may be only a *mêlée* of ministerial ambitions. I propose to study the characters

¹ Bouleau, *Épître VIII, Au Roi*.

² La Fontaine, *Fables*, XI, 5, *Le Lion, le Singe et les deux Anes*

³ Corneille, *Othon*, I, 1.

⁴ "Il fallait qu'on sentît déjà Louvois perdu pour qu'on osât cela" (Michelet, *Louis XIV et le Duc de Bourgogne*, Paris, Chamerot, 1862 II, 21). The interpretation designates Louis as "le jouet" of his minister, but also conveys the assurance that, like Ahasuerus, he needed only "qu'un beau désespoir le secourût"; cf. III, 4

⁵ Cf. C. Dejob, *Études sur la Tragédie*, Paris, Colin, n. d., 89-90

⁶ *Id.*, 78.

represented, as for the historical parallels, it is safe to say, I believe, that the most interesting were not spotted by the contemporaries, nor perhaps intended by the dramatists.

Although the minister had had a long literary history his dramatic treatment had been meager. The Greeks gave no models. The elders of Aeschylus's *Persae* who govern for an absent king are inert. The Creon of Sophocles is a vehicle of favor or brutality, depending upon the master he serves.⁷ Ulysses, the agent of the more prominent kings of Greece, limits himself to the execution of specific orders.⁸

The French Renaissance drama pictured the minister as an advocate of the *raison d'état* that overrules the better nature of kings or a villain whose power and fragility equally condemn the monarch who makes him and breaks him. The impersonal counselor (for example, the "chœur des États" in Montchrétien's *Reine d'Écosse*) upholding the discipline of the profession of a king need not be considered here.⁹ The other figure was borrowed from the biblical story of Haman. The French adaptations did not improve upon the original tale, only emphasized its meaner features.¹⁰ Montchrétien's Haman, the best of the early copies of Ahasuerus's minister, a lieutenant and friend extraordinary to his king, is a garrulous and petty parvenu throughout the play. The king pronounces his doom (without the excuse of the misinterpreted appeal which the Bible provided)¹¹ when Esther claims she is one of Haman's targets in his attack on the Jews—an assertion which the play does not support. Ahasuerus declares that the anti-Jewish campaign was undertaken "sans alleguer raison," thus impugning his previous acclaim of the project (II). Deceiver or dupe, the minister is a fitting counterpart to an unstable king.

The minister whose influence attests the incapacity of his king is a conception that the theater, ever prompt to exhibit the weaknesses of kings, did not entirely relinquish. The successors of Haman resemble him in that under more competent rulers they

⁷ Cp *Oedipus Rex* and *Oedipus Coloneus*

⁸ Cf for ex., Sophocles, *Philoctetes*

⁹ Cf my article, "L'Art de Régner . . .," *MLN* (1935), I, 7

¹⁰ Cf E. Faguet, *La Tragédie Française au XVI^e Siècle*, Paris, Fontemoing, 1912 85-86, 365-367

¹¹ Here Haman's appeal to Esther follows the death sentence

would be less powerful. Racine's Mathan (*Athalie*) traces the course of the ubiquitous sycophant clearly enough to make further analysis unnecessary,

J'approchai par degres de l'oreille des rois,
Et bientôt en oracle on érigea ma voix
De mesure et de poids je changeois à leur gre
Prêtant à leurs fureurs des couleurs favorables (III, 3)

If we add that the oracle was usually sacrificed to his client's reputation, we have the career of most of the drama's ministers.¹² But some were above the parasites of credulous kings and displayed, for good or evil, in aiding or thwarting their masters, a firm purpose. The distinction between the leader and the toady, and further between the upright and the mischievous leaders, would be clearer, however, if the constant proximity of the epithet *sinistre* which the rhyme evokes did not overshadow all *ministres*, and if a minister was never made the scapegoat of his king.

Another possible source of confusion is the uncertainty of titles. For the object of this discussion it has seemed reasonable to include among the ministers the *heutenants*, *favoris*, *confidents* who counsel a ruler or speak in his name on affairs of state. A *confident* acting the part of a minister has as good a brevet, I believe, as a *ministre d'État* playing the confidant.¹³

The story of the good minister in his direct relations with his king is generally of one pattern. With the common run of the kings he is ineffectual. His notion of the *art de régner* would substitute poise and toleration for rashness and gullibility, equity in lieu of caprice, and he must persuade one who

prend vn bon advis, pour vne trahison,
Et ne peut écouter la voix de la raison¹⁴

¹² For ex, Sosibe (Guérin de Bouscal, *Oléomène*, 1638), Aspar (Scudéry, *Eudoxe*, 1639), Photin (Corneille, *Pompée*, 1643), Narcisse (Racine, *Britannicus*, 1670) In Th Corneille's *Cinna* (1661) Phédime is rebuffed by a repentant usurper (I, 1) The minister may serve to express the king's wish, thus diverting the responsibility, cf Corneille, *Suréna* (1674), III, 1.

¹³ Cf Gillet de la Tessonnerie, *Sigismond* (1647), Corneille, *Tite et Bérénice* (1670)

¹⁴ *Eudoxe*, II, 1 Cf Scudéry, *l'Amour Tyrannique* (1638), I, 2, II, 4; Rotrou, *Saint-Genest* (1645), IV, 6, Puget de La Serre, *Thomas Morus* (1640).

Nor is this the top of his burden. The rules of bienséance, which will not permit that a sovereign be disgraced, hold the minister responsible for decisions that he has vainly opposed¹⁵ Success itself is precarious, royal acknowledgment being unpredictable.¹⁶ An enlightened king's praise of the minister who labours "sans penser à soy"¹⁷ (probably a panegyric of Richelieu, surely out of proportion to the rôle of the man who provoked it) can only emphasize the dismal picture. But if debates with his king and punishment at the hands of the king's adversaries are the more evident features, they are not the whole of the minister's service. There is a more mysterious and fertile field where, in the king's entourage, usually without the king's knowledge and sometimes against the king's wishes, the vigilant minister does his police work. There he generally is a winner . . . and a loser as well, in another sense.

Instances of clear victory are found in Rotrou's *Cosroès* and Thomas Corneille's *Pyrrhus*. In both plays a minister protects the rightful successor of the king, the one against a stepmother, the other against a *favori*. Without disparaging their achievements it must be said that Rotrou's man, who must defeat a mad king and an infuriated queen, is assisted by popular sentiment, and Corneille's champion, who must conciliate a suspectful monarch, possesses information that ruins his opponent's scheme. Other examples of similar deeds would not add to the study of the character; suffice it to say that the minister who upholds "le droit d'ainesse et la loi de l'état" ordinarily comes through sans peur et sans reproche . . . and sans anything much in the way of thanks.¹⁸

In some cases the opposition is so formidable that the minister lets such concerns as his safety and that of his associates and his country blur the integrity of his course. The situation affords a penetrating study of man and motive and constitutes the most interesting phase of the minister's drama. I might then be per-

¹⁵ For ex., Achilles in *Pompée*, cf. I, 1 and v, 3.

¹⁶ Cf. article cited and *The Conqueror* . . . , *MLN*, LII, 1, Jan., 1937; Campistron, *Alcibiade*, I, 1 (cited by Dejob).

¹⁷ *Eudowe*, v, 3 (cited by Lancaster, *A History of French Dramatic Literature*, Part II, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1932 I, 235).

¹⁸ In *Cosroès* the prince is about to scuttle the minister's work when fate intervenes and the king commits suicide. *Pyrrhus* ends on a promise of reward on the part of a king who enjoys a short memory. Cf. Corneille, *Héraclius*.

mitted to examine in some detail two instances of the effect of the office upon the man. The *Cléomène* of Guérin de Bouscal offers an early illustration. Chrisme warns the incompetent Ptolémée against Cléomène, deposed king of Sparta whom he suspects of attempting to make Ptolémée "le butin de Sparte et de sa propre armée." He supplements Ptolémée's aid to Cléomène with measures for the protection of Egypt, and is disturbed at Cléomène's resentment of his precautions. But when Sosibe, a fellow minister, suggests that a certain merchant could ruin Cléomène by revealing some ambiguous utterances of the latter, Chrisme balks,

Ce marchand est suspect, il hayt trop Cléomène (III, 1)

Sosibe explains "nous pouvons profiter de sa hayne." The other hesitates what Cléomène has said

ne seroit pas capable
De faire que le Roy le traistast en coupable (III, 1)

Under Sosibe's coaching, however, the merchant can repeat what he has heard,

L'aggravant toutesfois avec subtilité
De quelques traits piquants contre la vérité (III, 2)

The trick having procured the arrest of Cléomène, Chrisme proceeds on his own initiative to perfect the trap. The dramatist has further marked the difference between the two ministers by having Chrisme quietly killed by Cléomène while Sosibe's execution will be immortalized by a monument.

A searching analysis of professional deterioration is contained in Thomas Corneille's *Comte d'Essex* (1678). The play does not exculpate Essex,¹⁹ nor does it prove him as guilty as his enemies claim. His extravagance is symptomatic, of course, his boastfulness, as Queen Elizabeth remarks,

Donne de la vertu d'assez foibles indices (II, 6),

and his defense, "La faute n'est pas grande" (II, 7),²⁰ is a notable

¹⁹ For a contrary opinion cf. L. Alfreda Hill, *The Tudors in French Drama, The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*, Vol. xx, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1932 138 *et seq*

²⁰ Refers to the Irish conspiracy. Cecil makes no use of the charge of assault on the queen's palace.

concession on his part. The minister Cecil, on the other hand, is affected by the threat of the vengeance Essex will command if Elizabeth chooses to pardon him. Failure to appreciate Cecil's position, reducing him to the rôle of a *Tartuffe*,²¹ robs the play of one of its tragic forces. One motive in forestalling Elizabeth's intervention,

ne balançons plus, puisqu'il faut éclater,
A prévenir le coup qu'il cherche à nous porter (I, 3),

is not justice, but neither would be pardon prompted by the unreasoning love of the queen for Essex. The queen's protest,

mon seul intérêt
N'a pas fait l'équité de ce cruel arrêt (V, 4),

is warranted, but it does not destroy Cecil's assertion

Qu'en punissant le comte on n'a puni qu'un traître (V, 4).

Cecil has committed a breach of law in carrying out an unsigned warrant of execution, but it is not as a mere "rival" of Essex that he confronts a furious Elizabeth with the noblest words of the play,

Ayant fait mon devoir, je puis ne craindre rien (V, 4),

although it is not as a minister who has acted "sans penser à soy."

The precedence given in this discussion to the good minister is not altogether arbitrary. Although some troublesome characters are to be found in the earlier dramatic cabinets, it is in the second half of the century that the bad minister has his sway. One is tempted to associate an exposé of the evil doings of ministers with the policy of Louis XIV regarding them; unfortunately the accompanying picture of kings who generally have none of the qualifications attributed to Louis, but, on the contrary, are to be judged by

Essex's friend, Salisbury, is not persuaded by his outbursts,

On produit des témoins, et l'indice est puissant (I, 1);
Je sais qu'en sa conduite il eut quelque imprudence (III, 3).

Essex himself grants that there are those among his accusers

Qui, parlant contre moi, parlent sans intérêt (I, 3);

but he does not admit that Cecil could be one of them.

²¹ Dejob, *op cit*, 82 "Cécile travaille hypocritement à perdre Leicester . . . , et ceux qu'il veut ruiner ou circonvenir le traitent avec une hauteur qui lui ôte toute grandeur tragique . . ." In Miss Hill's opinion Cecil is goaded by Essex's contempt into prosecuting "his rival."

the quality of the agents they keep, does not sustain the analogy.²² The source of the drama's audacity may have been the contemporary movement described by M. Paul Hazard in his *Crise de la Conscience Européenne*²³ I speak with hesitancy, however, since M. Hazard has not enrolled the evidence of the theater among the manifestations of the new spirit. Be that as it may, the development of the mischievous minister begins in the 1660's Campistron's Léon and Marcène (*Andronic*) are not as novel as Dejob claimed. They had contemporaries in the preceding generation of the Vinus and Lacus (*Othon*), the Didas (*Persée et Démétrius*) and Androchide (*Pyrrhus*) of the Corneilles. It is true that the duumvirate of Colbert and Louvois adds flavor to the dramatic legend of ministers struggling among themselves for supremacy.

Most of the specimens of the minister who

A sa seule grandeur sans relâche s'applique²⁴

share two common traits. The Turk fearing for his "droits de la guerre,"²⁵ the Macedonian who apprehends the rise of a popular ruler,²⁶ the Greeks dreading the accession of a prince with grievances against them²⁷ see beyond the departure of

Un maître qui sans eux n'ose rien consentir²⁸

the prospect of one who "en sait trop." They are equally anxious to tell just what knowledge they fear in a new ruler. With an effusiveness which is worthy of Montchretien's Haman and sets a precedent for the "comédie rosse" they complacently unpack their

²² Agésilas (Corneille, *Agésilas*, 1666) defends his authority against a trespassing subordinate (III, 1)

Louis may have remembered *Othon* when he wrote in his *Mémoires* of 1668 that an old king who has several ministers will see them "bien plus appliqués à s'élever l'un au-dessus de l'autre qu'à maintenir la grandeur de son état" (ed Longnon, Paris, Plon, 1933: 269)

²³ Paris, Boivin, 1935

²⁴ Th Corneille, *Persée et Démétrius* (1662), I, 2

²⁵ Mairat, *Solyman* (1637), I, 4. The strife between the vizir and the sultan's son refutes Dejob's assertion that before Campistron "la lutte ouverte ou sourde de la famille royale avec les conseillers du roi" was not represented. Cf *Persée et Démétrius*

²⁶ *Persée et Démétrius*, II, 1

²⁷ Campistron, *Andronic* (1685), I, 2.

²⁸ *Othon*, I, 1

hearts. With much to tell in sins of the past and provisions for the future they make increasing demands for consideration, directly or indirectly accaparate the action and leave to their masters little more than the title of the play.

The intrusion began when one minister debated with another over the policy of their king.²⁹ It grew with the insufficiency of the kings until the winning minister became the observed of all observers, since the monarch himself was annexed, so to speak, to the person who best exploited him, thus a confidant tells Néoptolémus,

De ces impressions qui troublent trop votre âme
Androclide sur moi va rejeter le blâme ³⁰

To conciliate or to defeat the prime minister is an ever encroaching concern. In *Persée et Démétrius* one hears variously "le secours," "l'artifice" of Didas, "J'emploierai vers Didas," "Ce ministre insolent",

Et prêt des deux Partis à se joindre au plus fort (I, 2),

Didas awaits his day. With playmates of their own caliber Androclide and Didas will have no difficulty in monopolizing the interest of the play. Two examples measure the usurpation. Corneille's *Othon* is a ministers' holiday

Nos ordres règlent tout, nous donnons, retranchons,
Rien n'est exécuté des que nous l'empêchons (II, 4)

But, as a king in former days would say, supreme authority cannot be shared, and Emperor Galba's cabinet counts three men. One, Lacus, visualizes a better reign,

notre indépendance iroit au dernier point,
Si l'heureux Vinus ne la partageoit point (II, 4)

²⁹ The *David Fugitif* of Des Masures (ed Société des Textes Français Modernes, Paris, Cornély, 1907) is one of the earliest examples *Eudoxe* is one of the models

³⁰ *Pyrrhus*, II, 1 A detail of ministerial psychology is brought out in Gelon's reference to Androclide,

Cette ombre de faveur l'aura saisi d'effroi (II, 1),
meaning the favor which Androclide enjoys,

Il voudra que jaloux de cette préférence
J'aye osé pour lui nuire armer votre vengeance (id.).

P Corneille expresses the same idea (*Othon*, I, 2), but not so clearly.

His ally, Martian, proposes to marry Vinius's daughter, but Lacus foresees a defection,

Vous seriez mon ami, mais vous seriez son gendre (II, 4)

When a pretender to Galba's succession wishes to marry Vinius's daughter the cabinet takes fright, and Vinius explains to the candidate,

Sans moi, sans mon crédit qu'à leurs desseins j'oppose,
Lacus et Martian vous auroient peu souffert,
Il faut à votre tour rompre un coup qui me perd
L'honneur que nous feroit votre illustre hyménée
Des deux que j'ai nommés tient l'âme si gênée,
Que jusqu'ici Galba, qu'ils obsèdent tous deux,
A refusé son ordre à l'effet de nos vœux (I, 2)

Regarding the designation of the next emperor, the "rivaux d'État"

voudront par ce choix se mettre en assurance,
Et n'en proposeront que de leur dépendance (I, 1)

Galba would forestall

les présages sinistres
De la division qu'il voit en ses ministres (IV, 3),

but can only deplore the quandary of a monarch

quand de ceux qu'il écoute
Le zèle cherche à prendre une diverse route (V, 2)

Andronic applies the suggestion of a character of *Othon*,

Grands ministres d'état, accordez-vous ensemble

Léon and Marcène create an axis to which every question in the play must be referred. Heretofore their enmity has been their bond,

Chacun de nous étoit un ministre fidèle,
Dont les vœux attachés sur un seul ennemi,
Toujours dans son devoir le tenoient affermi (I, 2)

They now face a common adversary, the prospective heir to the throne, all the more dangerous for his pacifism,

Que serions-nous tous deux dans un état tranquille?
L'empereur, libre alors de craintes et de soins,
Étant plus absolu, nous écouterait moins (I, 2).

United they have no difficulty in protecting themselves. The peti-

tion that secures the destruction of the prince confirms by its candor the new standing of ministers,

vous voyez, seigneur, qu'il nous menace
Ses chagrins, qu'il ne peut élever jusqu'à vous,
Avec plus de fureur retomberont sur nous (II, 6)³¹

The impotence of the monarchs is emphasized by their realization of their plight. Galba suspects in his men

Cette haine à tous deux obstinément fidèle,
Qui peut-être, en dépit des maux qu'elle prévoit,
Seule en mes intérêts se consulte et se croit (v, 2)

Paléologue (*Andronic*) intrigued to prevent the coalition that overwhelmed him,

Souvent nos demelés étant prêts de finir,
L'empereur a pris soin de les entretenir (I, 2)

Timid authority finds a stranger outlet in Racine's *Esther*. Assuérus lays himself open to a charge of pinpricking, and his humor meets a crushing comment,

Roi cruel, ce sont là les jeux où tu te plais (III, 1).

The dénouement of the minister's rôle keeps pace with its internal evolution. The fate of the luckless counsellor,

l'exil, la prison, que dis-je? une mort prompte
[or]

Chez la postérité fait passer notre honte,³²

is no longer suitable to a character that has risen above luck. In the earlier plays a defeated minister was summarily handled: the monarch condemned him or the people lynched him,³³ under extenuating circumstances he was killed in action or banished.³⁴ The tradition persists;³⁵ but Lacus and Vinus are not defeated, and their death, at the climax of their strife,³⁶ carries no shame; as for Léon and Marcène, their end is hardly to be foretold.

³¹ Cp Rotrou, *Venceslas* (1647), v, 7.

³² *Andronic*, I, 2

³³ *Cléomène*, *Persée et Démétrius*, *Pyrrhus*.

³⁴ *Cléomène*, *Eudoxe*, *Solyman*

³⁵ Martian, the least prominent of Galba's ministers is arrested.

³⁶ Lacus kills Vinus and himself.

A short study does not permit a complete analysis of every character presented. I can only hope to have justified some rough conclusions. The minister who appears in the French drama of the Renaissance as an incompetent monarch's parasite attains in the second quarter of the XVIIth century a measure of independence. He—that is the more audacious examples of him—then proceeds to a more evident individuality. With motives too complex for easy classification he is permitted, in one or two instances, to grow in the course of a play. In the latter part of the century there emerges a sinister figure whose disputes and conspiracies with colleagues of his own mettle relegate the rôle of a king to a background of helplessness and futility.

MAURICE BAUDIN

New York University

PETTIE AND GREENE

On reading the novels of Robert Greene (1558²-1592), we are struck by the number of his natural history similes and proverbs, and wonder who supplied him with the information. We already know, from a study which H. C. Hart published some years ago in *Notes and Queries*¹ that Greene borrowed extensively from John Lyly's *Euphues* (1578), and *Euphues and his England* (1580). But there were earlier writers who furnished Greene with material,² and of these men, George Pettie (1548-1589) was the most important. His modest collection of tales, *A Petite Pallace Of Pettie His Pleasure* (1576)³ has been overshadowed, both in literary history and as a source of the so-called euphuistic style, by Lyly's more recent *Euphues*.⁴

¹ Tenth Series, iv (1905), 1-5, 162-164, 224-227

² See my unpublished thesis, *Natural History in the Works of Robert Greene*, in the Harvard College Library.

³ The edition used in this note is that of Israel Gollancz (London, 1908).

⁴ Hart notes (*op cit*, p 1) · "That he [i e Greene] was Lyly's ape is obvious, and no one put this more clearly than Jusserand, so far as method and style go" *Cambridge History of English Literature*, III, 356 "When Lyly was popular, Greene adopted his methods, when romance was called for, he also complied" Ernest A. Baker, *History of the English Novel*, II, 93. "His [i e Greene's] first love-pamphlet . . . is not only composed throughout in the style of *Euphues*, it actually takes Lyly's initial situa-

More than Lyly, Pettie was the true creator of the school to which writers like Munday, Lodge, Melbancke, and Grange with their "love-pamphlets" belonged. And although Lord Berners in his translation of Guevara's *Golden Boke* had anticipated the style, the foundation stone of which is the simile, it was Pettie, who, to the moralizing tone and to the style, added the love story which forms the center of Greene's narrative. To this narrative technique Greene contributed little; indeed, as far as the modern reader is concerned, he seems less skilful in telling his story because of his tendency to insert long debates and letters. But with similes, where Pettie has one, Greene has a dozen. Thus, in one of his tales, Pettie has the heroine write a letter to her suitor; in *Mamilha*, part II, Greene borrows the substance and makes a few additions.

Pettie

Sir, by how much more I know the inconveniences and infinite troubles mixed with marriage, by so much less do I like to enter into that estate again. And where you pretend to prefer me before all worldly goods, I take it rather for words of course than talk of troth, for as in the fairest rose is soonest found a canker, so in fairest speech is falsehood and feigning rifest. For I know the fashion of you men is by your subtilty to deceive our simplicity, and by a few filed words to bring us into a fools paradise."

Greene

It is hard, M *Pharicles* to purchase credit by the praise of anything, w^e either defect of nature, or want of arte do blemish so that I take thē for words of course, rather thē for tales of troth, thinking & fearing to find in y^e fairest rose, a foule canker & in finest speech, foulest falshood. It is grieuē to y^e wolf by nature, to be cruel to the lion to be fierce to the fox subtilnes & as wel it is ingrafted in man, both by nature & educatio, to be dissēbling so y^t it is a settled sētēce amōgst thē he y^t cannot dissēble cānot lue. & he that cannot w^t a fewē filed words bring a maide into a fooles paradise cannot loue."

It can be seen at a glance that Greene has borrowed directly from Pettie, and that he must have had the *Petite Pallace* before him, unless he was gifted with an extraordinary memory. By inserting

tion and reverses it." But Baker does acknowledge Pettie's importance, although he cites neither primary nor secondary evidence, *ibid*, II, 98 "All the metaphors and fantastic similes of Pettie and Lyly are repeated as if they were current coin"

"Ed. Gollancz, I, 115-116

"Alexander B. Grosart, ed., *The Life and Complete Works In Prose and Verse of Robert Greene*, II, 131-132.

a few natural history figures of the most obvious sort, and adding some commonplace observations, he has clogged the narrative, has separated the beginning so far from the end that the reader, bogged in the middle, tends to lose the thread of the letter. Another example of this propensity for expansion on the part of Greene is to be found in the *Tritameron of Love*.

Pettie

But I see, and I sigh and sorrow
to see, that there is no cloth so fine
but moths will eat it, no iron so
hard but rust will fret it, no wood
so sound but worms will putrify it,
no metal so coarse but fire will
purify it, nor no maid so free but
love will bring her into thraldom
and bondage (II, 55)

Greene

This *Bonfadio* shrouded thus
vnder Fortune, and shrined vp by
fame, tryed at last by prooffe, which
long before he had heard by report,
that the stiffest mettall yeeldeth to
the stamp, the strongest Oke to the
Carpenters axe, the hard steele to
the fyle, and the stoutest hart doth
bow, when Nature bids him bend,
that there is no Adamant such,
which the blood of a Goate can not
make soft, no tree so sound which
the Scarabbe flye will not pearce, no
Iron so hard which rust will not
fiet, no mortall thing so sure which
time will not consume, nor no man
so valiant which commeth not with
out excuse when Death doth call
(III, 51-52).

Again, it can be seen that Greene has taken the material and construction from Pettie, applied it to a different theme, and elaborated on it. The similes, with the exceptions of those of the "Scarabbe flye," which came, perhaps, from Gosson, and of the "Adamant," are of the obvious kind. A third example occurs in *Mamilha*, part II.

Pettie

For the increase is small of seed
too timely sown, the whelps are ever
blind that dogs in haste do get .
and he that leapeth before he look,
may hap to leap into the brook (II,
61)'

Greene

Wel, those whelps are euer blind,
that dogs beget in hast y^e seed too
timely sown hath euer smal in-
crease he that leaps before he
looke, may hap to light in y^e ditch
he that settles his affection in such
speed, as he makes choyce without
discretiō see his hasty choosing may
perchāce get a heauy bargain (II,
121-122).

From the evidence of the passages transcribed above, there can be no doubt that Greene had Pettie's book before him as he wrote. Nor did he try to disguise the borrowing, unless the juggling of the order of the similes can be an attempt to deceive the reader. The remaining parallels, some so close that they are better described as pilferings, are given below.

Pettie

As the spider feeleth if her web
be pricked but with the point of a
pin, so if our child be touched but
with the least trouble that is, we
feel the force of it to pierce us to
the heart (I, 186)

Greene

As the Spider feeleth if her web
be prick't, so if they [our children]
be toucht but with the point of a
pinne, so if they be toucht but with
the least trouble, wee feelee the
paines thereof with prickinge griefe
to pinch vs (IV, 16)

These passages are almost identical. The alterations which Greene has made in his striving for alliteration seem to mark a further stage of development from simplicity to euphuism at the expense of rhythm. To the modern reader, Pettie's prose seems to be more effective.

Pettie

They are rather like the stone of
Sicilia, which the more it is beaten
the harder it is, or like spices,
which the more they are pounded
the sweeter they are (II, 133) ¹

Greene

Shée will proue lyke the Stone of
Silicia, which the more it is beaten,
the harder it is or like the spices
of *Ionia*, which the more they are
pounded the lesse sauour they yeeld
(IV, 46)

It will be observed that Greene derives his "spices" from a particular place, and makes them unique among their kind. But he has the more familiar variety in *Arbasto*, "the pure spice, . . . the more it is poun[d]ed the sweeter it smelleth" (III, 235), and in the *Carde of Fancie*, "The fine spice, . . . the more it is pounded, the sweeter smel it yeelds" (IV, 183). As for the "stone of Sicilia," Greene indulges in a favorite trick of his when he endows other minerals with the same properties. In the *Carde of Fancie* he writes, "The stone *Terpistretes*, the more it is beaten, the harder it is" (IV, 183), and in *Alcida*, "the Crysolite, . . . the more it is beaten with hammers, the harder it is" (IX, 28).

Pettie

As the biting of a mad dog rageth
and rankleth until it have brought
the body bitten to bane (I, 124)

Virginitie is as rare as
the black swan (I, 89)

The fine marble you know needeth
no painting, that is needful only for
ragged walls (II, 163)

As the swift running stream if it
be not stopped runneth smoothly
away without noise, but if there be
any dam or lock made to stay the
course thereof, it rageth and roareth
and swelleth above the banks (I,
98)

Ripest fruit are rifest rotten (I,
104)

One swallow makes not summer
(I, 138)

In largest seas are sorest tem-
pests (I, 101)

The malt is never sweet unless
the fire be soft (II, 61)

He thought the grass had
been cut from under his feet (I,
121)

[It is like] fire the more it is
kept down, the more it flameth up
(I, 80)

The cocatrice by sight only slayeth
(I, 17)

That which is bred in the bone,
will not out of the flesh (II, 85).

The fine gold must be purified in
the flaming fire (I, 142)

Greene

As the byting of a viper ranckleth
& rageth, till he hath brought the
body bittē to bain (II, 125)

Virgins are as rare as black
Swans (VIII, 27)

Marble Stones [do] need no
colouring (XIII, 378)

They that seeke to stop the
swift running *Volgo*, a Riuer that
leadeth into *Persia*, by staying the
streame, maketh the flood flow more
fiercely (XII, 34)

The fruits too soone ripe are
quickly rotten (VI, 131)

One swallow maketh not sommer
(III, 73)

In the largest Seas are the sorest
tempests (IV, 32)

The malt is euer sweetest, when
the fire is softest (IX, 66)

Suffer not the grasse to bee cut
from vnder thy feete (III, 224)

To repress the fire, is to make it
flame more furiouslye (IV, 100).

The Cockatrice killeth euen with
her sight (II, 74).

That which is bred by the bone
will not easily out of y^e flesh (II,
199)

[It is] like the golde that is neuer
perfect till it hath past through the
fornace (III, 246)

[Like] the bird caught in lime
the more they strive the faster they
stick (I, 97)

As the spider out of most sweet
flowers sucketh poison (II, 76)

The cameleon changeth himself
into the colour and hue of every-
thing he doth view (I, 50)

The Panther with his gay
colours and sweet smell, allureth
other beastes unto him, and being
within his reach, he ravenously de-
voureth them (I, 123)

Consider the quality of the she-
wolf who always chooseth that wolf
for her make who is made most lean
and foul by following her (I, 19)

The byrde being taken in the
nette, by struggling becomes faster
(II, 96)

With the spider sucke poison out
of the most pretious flowers (XII,
180)

[It is] turning like to the Ca-
meleon into the likenesse of euerie
Object (VIII, 22)

The Panther with his painted skin
and his sweet breath is the more
delighted [in] (II, 44)

They delyght with the shee
Woulfe to choose the foulest make
(IV, 132) ⁷

Another trait of style which Pettie and Greene share is the use of a great many alliterative combinations like "tempest of trouble," "puff of prosperitie," "pit of perplexitie," "mist of misery," "flood of fickleness," etc. Now it may be more than a question of sharing, as with the similes, Greene may have borrowed the trick from Pettie, and as with the similes, used it more frequently. One alliterative phrase which Greene was fond of using was "soppes of suspition." It occurs again and again. Occasionally seeking variety, he associates the "sop" with another word, and writes "sop of the same sauce," or "sower sops of aduersitie." This last combination occurs in the *Pallace*. In order to indicate the similarity between the styles of the two writers, I shall transcribe the two passages in which the expression appears.

Pettie

It is the provident policy of the
divine power, to the intent we
should not be too proudly puffed up
with prosperity, most commonly to
mix it with some sour sops of ad-

Greene

How hath nature ordayned by her
prudent pollicy that for euery
proud puff of prosperitie some sower
sops of aduersitie for euery mite
of happinesse, a thousand chips of

⁷ Many of these sententiae can also be found in collections like those of Heywood and of Erasmus.

versity, and to appoint the river of our happiness to run in a stream of heaviness, as by all his benefits bountifully bestowed on us, may be plainly perceived, whereof there is not any one so absolutely good and perfect, but that there be inconveniences as well as commodities incurred thereby (II, 51-52).

il chance for euery dram of felicity, a whole shewre of shrewd fortune & when the sun of good succes shineth most cleerely, then comes the cloudes of care, & mists of mischief, when they are most vnlooked for for y^t I perceue it is cōmon, as true, how amōgst humane thinges nothing is stable in one state (II, 127-128)

From the passages given above, it can be readily seen that it is a mistake to regard Lyly's *Euphues* as the spring of the particular style to which his book gave its name, and hence as the main source of Greene's prose. All the characteristics of euphuism to be found in Greene's work are present in Pettie's novel, especially the characteristic similes and proverbs.⁸

C. J. VINCENT

Queens University
Kingston, Ontario

MELBANCKE AND GOSSON¹

In a series of articles Professors Tilley² and Rollins³ have presented such overwhelming evidence of Brian Melbancke's acquisitiveness that a further example seems decidedly *de trop*. However, in presenting the proof of Melbancke's indebtedness to Gosson's *The Ephemerides of Phialo*, one is motivated by two factors. Gosson's work is essentially a treatment of the theory of friendship, a theory that receives parabolical attention in *Philotimus*. Then, one of the chief interlocutors in Gosson's book is

⁸ Herbert Hartman's edition of the *Pallace*, which appeared when this article was in proof, shows Pettie's importance in the history of euphuism.

¹ The material for this note was gathered while the compiler was a fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies. He is obliged to Dr R. B. McKerrow for suggesting Gosson as a potential source.

² "Further Borrowings from Poems in *Philotimus*," *SP*, xxvii (1929), 186-214.

³ "Notes on Brian Melbancke's *Philotimus*," *SP*, extra ser. i (1928), 40-57, "Notes on the Sources of Melbancke's *Philotimus*," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology*, xviii, 177-198, "Thomas Deloney and Brian Melbancke," *ibid.*, xix, 219-229.

Philotimo. Since Phylotimus is one of the sons in Gascoigne's *The Glass of Government* and since the name appears in all sorts of odd Renaissance books, such as the *Dialogus mythologicus* of Bartolomeus Colonis, one cannot assume that Gosson gave Melbancke his central character. One can, however, believe that Gosson emphasized the name.

Omitting stale commonplaces of the age which show no verbal parallelism, there are at least sixteen direct borrowings in *Phylotimus* (1583) from *The Ephemerides of Phialo* (1579). The interesting thing about these loans is that they are grouped. The reader will notice that most of Melbancke's loans are printed in the E and R gatherings of his novel. This would suggest that he picked up Gosson's book at these points and deliberately leafed through it in search of usable material. The loans may be presented in parallel form.

Melbancke

Much like, as though Uliesses reioys-
ing in the smoake of his country
Ithaca, as a sign of his nere ap-
proaching (C1^r)

Alciabiades was a scholar at Athens,
a hunter in Lacedemonia, and a
carpet knight at Tisapherne (E2^v)

When the kinges fisher laeth her
eggs, the seas are calme till they be
hatcht (E2^{r-v})

Sore eyes may not vewe the light
without a scarfe (E3^r)

The cunning Fowler is cloathed
with feathers, the craftye Raunger
in a Deeres skinne. (E3^r)

As Antiochus at one push lost all
Asia (E3^r)

Gosson

Uliesses reioysed in the smoke of
Ithaca, but it was for the love he
bare his countrie (55^r)

Alciabiades at Athens did hunt &
hawk, & behave himself pleasantly
in company, At *Lacedaemon* he
shaved his head, put on the robes
of a scholler, & lived solitary
in *Tisapherne* hee lived like a
wanton Lover, ever cutting his cloth
too the fashion of them with whome
hee was conversante (40^r)

When the Kings fisher laeth hei
egges, the seas are calme till they
bee hatcht. (36^v)

And because that sore eyes maye
not vewe the light without a scarfe
(20^r)

The cunning fouler, is clothed in
fethers, the crafty raunger, in
Deares skinner (40^v)

that Phillip at one push lost all
Macedon, Antiochus, Asia (7^r)

I will deale with them, as the Romanes did wt Vulcane for having received some hurt of fire, they thought it good to hould a candell before the devill, and speake him faire while their feete were in his mouth, and give unto Vulcan the honour of a God, mary they shut him out of ye citie to bannish him their company that he came no more there (E3r-v)

In olde time they were forbidden to expound oracles which had any botch in their bodyes (E3v)

Venus herselfe passing by Eurota, was enforced to begg some ayde of Pallas and use her lance (E3v)

I will not blowe retreate to every trayne, nor be a scholler and a traytour, as Critias was to Socrates (E3v)

Hymeraeus ye poete writt against Helen, & not long after recanted (F1v)

Though I were Calvitus yt forgot the names of his most familiar acquaintance G4v)

The skilfull beholde the picture of Aesculapius, commende not the picture, but the painter, we extoll not so much the taste of our meat, as the cookes cunning that seasoned it, no man estemeth his coine for the stampe, but for ye right mettall when it commeth to the touche (R2v)

The *Romans* because they had received some hurt by fyre, thought it good to holde a candle before the Devil, and gave unto *Vulcan* the honor of a god, but shut him out of the Citie (38r)

They were forbid in ancient time too expounde Oracles, whiche had any botch about their body (14r)

Venus her self when she passed Eurota, caste away her combe and her brush, her Glasse & her Litpot, and took up a Javelin (5r-v)

he little considereth that Alcibiades and Critias were both Scholers to Socrates, yet the one a Traytour, the other a Tyrant (9r)

Hymeraeus the Poet did write against *Helen*, but at last was glad too recant his sayings. (46v)

as *Clavitus Sabinus*, which was so troubled with as short a memory, that every minute he forgote the names of . such as he knew well being very familiar with them, and dayly conversant in their company (91v. Gosson then relates how Calvitus hired servants to remind him, the same tale is recounted by Melbancke on H2r)

The skilfull that beholde the Image of *Minerva*, commende not the picture but the Paynter, we extoll not so much the tast of our meate, as the Cookes cunning that seasoned it well, no man esteemeth his coyne for the stampe, but for the right metal when it come to the touch (54v)

Where by it will fare with mee, as
it did with Democritus, who gounge
about for sorrowe of his sisters mis-
hap to famishe himselfe, was re-
lieved three daies with the smell of
newe breade (R2^v)

Oribasius knew a philosopher in his
time who lived by the smell of
honey (R3^r)

Democritus for sorrowe of his sis-
ters mishap, going aboute too fam-
ish himselfe, was releevd three
daies with the smel of new breade
(53^v)

Oribasius protesteth that he knew
a Philosopher in his time, which
lived a while by the sente of homie.
(53^v)

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Duke University

SWIFT, MOTTE AND THE COPYRIGHT STRUGGLE. TWO UNNOTICED DOCUMENTS

There is considerable evidence in the correspondence of Jonathan Swift that he was, during the years 1735-7, interesting himself in the copyright controversy then very much alive. The twenty-one year term of copyright granted by the Act of 1710¹ was, in its application to several published works, coming to an end in the early 1730's. Litigation in Chancery quickly began, with plaintiff booksellers seeking to enjoin what they alleged to be infringements on their common law rights independent of statute. I doubt very much whether Swift would have interested himself in this matter, particularly at his advanced age, had not one of the cases struck home to Dublin, involved his own works, and had it not given him an excellent opportunity to enlarge the affair into another example of English oppression of the Irish. Slender as the excuse was, the old fighter was brought again to his feet, he was no legalist and Motte's injunction against Faulkner was a sufficiently red English flag to arouse the Irish bull.

I wish to point out some evidence of this concern of Swift that came to light with the publication of the Bathurst papers in 1923,² but I shall reserve the presentation of the items in question to their appropriate places in the story

¹ Statute 8 Anne c 19 This provision became effective after April 10, 1710

² Historical Manuscripts Commission. Bathurst, London, 1923. The two items are found on p. 10

Benjamin Motte, the London bookseller and publisher, successor to the business of Swift's earlier publisher, Benjamin Tooke, brought out Gulliver's Travels in 1726 and followed that great success by publishing in 1727 the first two volumes of the *Miscellanies* of Swift and Pope (including a few pieces by Gay and Arbuthnot). Two more volumes (*The Last Volume* and *The Third Volume*, in this order) presently appeared, and the *Miscellanies*, in whole or part, were frequently reprinted in London and Dublin before 1734. It is indeed difficult to follow the bibliographical maze of Swift's works through this period, new pieces were constantly being added, and editions were coming out rapidly.³ In any case, many of the items included had originally been published before the statute of 1710 went into effect.

George Faulkner, the Dublin printer who was called by Chesterfield "The Hibernian Atticus," seems to have made Swift's acquaintance about 1726. An Irishman by birth and education, he returned to Dublin from London about this time to set up his own press. In 1732 we note his imprint on Swift items and find the first letter written by Swift to him denying the authorship of a pamphlet about which a wager had been made.⁴

Early in 1733, Swift, writing to the Earl of Oxford, refers to Faulkner as "the prince of Dublin printers" in a letter to be borne by him to Oxford, and Swift further states that the printer is then engaged "in a work that very much discontents me, yet I would rather have it fall into his hands, than any others on this side."⁵ The "work" is an edition of Swift's works that Faulkner was shortly to bring out. Writing to Pope on May 1 of the same year, Swift again refers to the matter, thus

The Collection you speak of is this. A printer came to me to desire he might print my works, as he called them, in four volumes by subscription. I said I would give no leave, and should be sorry to see them printed here. He said they could not be printed in London. I answered they could, if the partners agreed. This refers to the works. He said he would be glad of my permission, but as he could print them without it, and was advised

³ I use chiefly W. Spencer Jackson's *Bibliography* in Vol. XII of Swift's *Prose Works*, ed. Temple Scott (London, 1897-1908), but have also consulted the recent bibliography of H. Teerink (*The Hague*, 1937).

⁴ *Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Ball (London, 1910-14), IV, 286 and note.

⁵ *Correspondence*, IV, 389.

that it could do me no harm, and having been assured of numerous subscriptions, he hoped I would not be angry at his pursuing his own interest, etc. Much of this discourse passed, and he goes on with the matter, wherein I determined not to intermeddle, though it be much to my discontent, and I wish it could be done in England, rather than here, although I am grown pretty indifferent in everything of that kind. This is the truth of the story.⁶

Faulkner proceeded, and Swift's "indifference" broke down considerably for he wrote the printer on June 29 saying that "since you intend to print a new edition of that book" [*Gulliver's Travels*] he desired that Faulkner secure from Mrs. Pilkington a paper containing corrections Swift had made to Motte's edition.⁷ Three months later, after failing to get the desired corrections from Mrs. Pilkington, Swift wrote to his friend Ford asking whether he still had the copy of *Gulliver* "interleaved and set right in those mangled and murdered Pages." "I wish you would please to let me know, whether You have such an interleaved Gulliver, and where and how I could get it, For to say the truth, I cannot with patience endure that mingled and mangled manner, as it came from Mottes hands; and it will be extreme difficult for me to correct it by any other means, with so ill a memory, and in so bad a State of health."⁸ The *Gulliver* finally printed contained not only corrections furnished by Ford but further revisions now generally attributed to Swift himself.⁹

Faulkner announced publication of the *Works*, in three volumes, in the "Dublin Impartial News Letter" of Saturday, November 23, 1734, promising delivery to subscribers of the first three volumes on the 27th, and the fourth on January 6th following. This was followed by an advertisement of January 19, 1735, of some length, from which the following excerpts are relevant:

The writings of the Reverend Dr J. S. D. S. P. D. were published six years ago in *London*, in three volumes, mingled with those of some other Gentlemen, his Friends. Neither is it easy to distinguish the Authors of several Pieces contained in them

.

⁶ *Ibid.*, IV, 431.

⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, 444.

⁸ *The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford*, ed. D. N. Smith (Oxford, 1935), 154, 155.

⁹ For a full discussion of the Faulkner edition and the part that Swift played in correcting and revising his own works see Harold Williams' Introduction to *Gulliver's Travels*, London, 1926.

It hath been long wished, by several Persons of Quality and Distinction, that a new compleat Edition of this Author's Works, should be printed by itself But this can no where be done so conveniently as in *Ireland*, where Booksellers cannot pretend to any Property in what they publish, either by Law or Custom

[There follows a description of the contents]

In this Edition, the gross Errors committed by the Printers, both here and in London, shall be faithfully corrected, the true Original, in the Author's own Hand having been communicated to us by a Friend in whom the Author much confided, and who had leave to correct his own printed Copies from the Author's most finished Manuscript, where several changes were made, not only in the Style, but in other material Circumstances

N B A compleat Edition of the Author's Works can never be printed in England, because some of them were published without his Knowledge or Liking, and consequently belong to different Proprietors, and likewise, because as they now stand, they are mingled with those of other Gentlemen his Friends ¹⁰

Thus was published Faulkner's edition of the works Swift told his friend Pultney, then sitting for Middlesex and still a leader of the Tory opposition, in a letter of March 8th that the publication was "utterly against" his will but that he was unable to hinder it, and he repeated his wish that it might have been done by the several London booksellers who had rights to his works He pointed out that there was "no property in printers or booksellers" in Ireland ¹¹ Much the same sentiments he expressed to Thomas Beach a month later, saying further that he was opposed to his works "being published in so obscure and wretched a country" ¹² Although he had written Pultney of the edition that he had "never yet looked into them, nor, I believe, ever shall," he seems to have peeked shortly afterward, for he wrote on May 12 to the same friend, "I saw one poem on you and a great Minister and was not sorry to find it there," ¹³ and by August had so far relented as to introduce Faulkner to Lord Howth as "an honest man and the chief printer." ¹⁴ Swift's protestations that he was opposed to Faulkner's project, or at least that he was indifferent, must be weighed against the clear evidence that he busied himself to secure

¹⁰ Both the announcement and advertisement are to be found in the *Correspondence*, v, Appendix v, p 449

¹¹ *Ibid*, v, 145

¹² *Ibid*, v, 163

¹³ *Ibid*, v, 180

¹⁴ *Ibid*, v, 222 See also the letter to Charles Wogan (1736), p 439

the corrections to *Gulliver's Travels* which make Faulkner's edition of 1735 the most nearly authentic one

Swift was correct in his statement that there was no "property" in books recognized in Ireland at this time, for the Act of 1710 did not hold outside England. English booksellers, owners of copy, could do nothing to prevent Irish reprinting of their editions and had to make the most of it as far as the Irish book market was concerned, but when Irish reprints began coming into the English market they were roused to action. A bill was introduced in Parliament in 1735 designed to give the booksellers a longer term of copyright and to control importation.¹⁵ Pultney wrote Swift on April 29

I have sent you the copy of a bill, now depending in our house, for the encouragement of learning, as the title bears, but I think it is rather of advantage to booksellers than authors. Whether it will pass or not this sessions, I cannot say, but if it should not, I should be glad of your thoughts upon it against another. It seems to me to be extremely imperfect at present.¹⁶

What Swift's thoughts were we don't know, but they were probably incorporated in one or both of two letters that have been lost which he wrote Pultney during subsequent months.¹⁷ At any rate, the bill failed to pass Parliament.

Motte, whose *Miscellanies* could not compete with Faulkner's *Works*, prepared to act. He wrote Swift on July 31.

Mr Faulkner's impression of four volumes has had its run. I was advised that it was in my power to have given him and his agents sufficient vexation, by applying to the law, but that I could not sue him without bringing your name into a court of justice, which absolutely determined me to be passive. I am told he is about printing them in an edition of twelve, in which case I humbly hope you will please to lay your commands upon him, which, if he has any sense of gratitude, must have the same power as an injunction in Chancery, to forbear sending them over here. If you think this request to be reasonable, I know you will comply with it, if not, I submit.¹⁸

¹⁵ For much of the material on the copyright struggle I rely on A. S. Collins' *Authorship in the Days of Johnson*, London, 1927, where an excellent account is to be found. See also R. G. Bowker, *Copyright: Its History and Its Law*, N. Y., 1912, especially Ch. III dealing with the development of statutory copyright in England.

¹⁶ *Correspondence*, v, 169.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, v, 280.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, v, 216.

We do not know whether Swift thought the request to be reasonable, but we do know that he did not exercise the remarkable judicial power attributed to him by Motte, and that Motte, likewise, did not submit, for he shortly thereafter entered a bill in Chancery, in spite of his earlier determination to keep Swift's name out of court at all costs. Motte wrote Swift on October 4, saying nothing of the Faulkner matter, and Swift replied on October 25. It is clear that he had not yet heard of Motte's action in equity.

Next in order, of the letters of Swift to Motte, in Ball's edition of the correspondence, is the following.

November 1, 1735.

Sir,

Mr Faulkner in printing those volumes did what I much disliked, and yet what was not in my power to hinder, and all my friends pressed him to print them, and gave him what manuscript copies they had occasionally gotten from me. My desire was that those works should have been printed in London, by an agreement between those who had a right to them. I am, Sir, with great truth,

Your most humble and affectionate servant,

Jon Swift¹⁰

To this Ball appends the note, "It would appear from what follows [i.e. the text of the letter] that Swift's letter of 25 October had crossed one from Motte complaining of the circulation of Faulkner's edition of Swift's 'works' in England." The editor's conjecture becomes a certainty now that we have in the Bathurst papers the full text of Swift's November 1 reply to Motte.

J Swift to Benjamin Motte, bookseller, at the Middle Temple Gate in Fleet Street, London

1735, Nov. 1 Dublin—I had not received your letter three minutes, nor opened it, for I was going abroad, when Mr Faulkner stopped the coach he was in (for he was coming to see me). So I called at his neighbor's, a friend of mine, and he came in to me. In the meantime I read your

¹⁰ Ball reprints this letter from the *Gentleman's Magazine*, N S, XLIII, 260, where it appears in an article printed in the February and March, 1855, numbers, entitled "Original Letters of Swift addressed to the Publisher of Gulliver's Travels." The article is based on five original letters owned by a Mr Arthur Preston of Norwich. There is some confusion in this article concerning which letters are which, but I conclude that the writer means to say that the letter in question is here published for the first time. Ball evidently thought so. It had, however, been printed in Swift's correspondence before, at least in Scott's edition of 1842 and Roscoe's edition of 1850.

letter, and gave it to him to read, he had many things to say in his defence, with which I cannot charge my memory, but have advised him to answer I know he passes for a perfectly honest man here, and a fair dealer, and I confess that the many oppressions we suffer from England sour my temper to the utmost Besides, the best lawyers, even those who came from England, say there is no law against importing into England any books that have been printed here For books are not yet among prohibited goods, unless they contain in them something against law and loyalty Upon the whole I think you had better suspend your suit till you hear what Mr Faulkner hath to say And as to my private opinion, it is that you will not find your interest in going further Mr Faulkner in printing these volumes here, did what I much disliked, and yet what was not in my power to hinder, and all my friends pressed him to print them, and gave him what manuscript copies they had occasionally got from me And he hath always behaved himself so decently to me that I can not treat him otherwise than as [a] well-meaning man, although my desire was that those works should have been printed in London by an agreement between those who *had a right* to them I wrote you a letter some days ago in answer to yours relating to Mrs Fenton

The absence of the conventional subscription to this letter leads me to believe that the "affectionate" one as printed in the abbreviated version is the work of some alien hand While Swift had been on very friendly terms with Motte, affection had never been the basis of their correspondence The shorter letter in its closing lines bears a suspicious resemblance to that which Swift wrote on October 25, "I am, with great truth, Sir, your most humble servant. J S" How the longer letter came into the hands of Swift's friend Lord Bathurst I do not know, it may be a copy by Swift transmitted to Bathurst at the time, in a letter since lost, for the two were then in correspondence

Thus the breach between Swift and Motte was widening, and Swift, touchy as usual when he could find Irish liberties involved, is swung to Faulkner's defense Motte's unwillingness to delay his suit, as suggested, would, of course, not help matters between them. The case presently came on for hearing, and although not reported it was cited later in the important case of *Miller vs. Taylor* (1769):²⁰

In the case of *Motte vs. Falkner*, 28th November, 1735 an injunction was granted for printing *Pope's* and *Swift's* Miscellanies Many of these pieces were published in 1701, 1702, 1708, and the counsel strongly pressed

²⁰ English Reports, 4 Burrow's 2325.

the objection, as to these pieces Lord *Talbot* continued the injunction, as to the whole and it was acquiesced under Yet *Falknor*, the *Irish* bookseller, was a man of substance, and the general point was of consequence to him but he was not advised to litigate further²¹

The objection pressed by counsel (*Faulkner's*) was that the earlier published works could not come under the Act of 1710 which had superceded the common law right to literary property. But, as A. S. Collins points out,²² neither in this case nor in the two similar ones that came up this same year could there be a plea that rights secured by the Act of 1710 had been infringed, and therefore the injunctions were based on the older common law right of copy which, in the opinion of the judges, still applied.

In this way was Swift's name brought into the copyright struggle, and a matter in which he had never before concerned himself greatly was brought home to him. On May 25, 1736, when he wrote Motte a letter which appears to have ended their correspondence, his indignation, if not "savage," is still strong. He admits that he has heard but one side of the case, but continues

only one thing I know, that the cruel oppressions of this kingdom by England are not to be borne You send what books you please hither, and the booksellers here can send nothing to you that is written here As this is absolute oppression, if I were a bookseller in this town, I would use all the safe means to reprint London books, and run them to any town in England, that I could, because whoever offends not the laws of God, or the country he lives in, commits no sin

. But I am so incensed against the oppressions from England, and have so little regard to the laws they make, that I do, as a clergyman, encourage the merchants both to export wool and woollen manufactures to any country in Europe, or anywhere else, and conceal it from the Custom-house officers, as I would hide my purse from a highwayman, if he came to rob me on the road, although England hath made a law to the contrary; and so I would encourage our booksellers here to sell your author's books printed here, and send them to all the towns in England, if I could do it

²¹ A note lists those works published in the years preceding the Statute of 1710. "1710, contests and dissensions between Athens and Rome 1707, productions for 1708 1708, Partridge's death. 1708, Sentiments of a Church of England-Man Vanbrugh's House. Baucis and Philemon 1709, Project for Advancement of Religion, and Reformation of Manners" This is the second case of the sort to be heard, the first, which came up earlier in 1735, involved the printing of *The Whole Duty of Man*, first published in 1657.

²² *Op. cit.*, 74.

with safety and profit, because, I repeat, it is no offence against God, or the laws of the country I live in

So wrote the Drapier, in the same tones he had so effectively employed a dozen years before

In spite of the success of booksellers in their employment of the injunction to support their copyright, they desired fresh legislation to clear the air and make their ventures more secure. Accordingly, after leave obtained from the House of Commons, a new Copyright Bill was introduced in February, 1737, and carried up to the House of Lords in April, where it was eventually shelved. Fortunately, a copy of this bill has been preserved²³ Mr. Collins has described some of its provisions and related its fate in the Lords. He hints that the peers may have felt that in the main its terms unduly favored the booksellers as against authors. But there was a clause in this bill that virtually would, had it become law, have given authors the whiphand, and this at a time when authors had as yet given little thought to the value or length of term of their copyright. Such a provision must have been slipped in, it is reasonable to suppose, at the instance of some writer, very likely someone who had had an unfortunate experience with booksellers. Mr. Collins quotes a section of the clause which would have barred authors from assigning their copies, except by testament, for any longer than ten years²⁴

Here enters Swift, the provoked author, who, no matter how "little regard" he had had for English laws when he had last written to Motte, now seeks legislation protecting authors, for in the Bathurst papers alongside the letter to Motte, appears, with the endorsement "Dean Swift's Clause," the full text of the section in question:

Clause in the Copyright Bill of 1737

1737.—Press 12 And for as much as the true worth of books and writings is in many cases not found out till a considerable time after the publication thereof, and the authors who are in necessity may often be tempted absolutely to sell and alienate the right which they will hereby have to the original copies of the books which they have composed before the value thereof is known, and may thereby put it out of their own power to alter

²³ See A. S. Collins, *op cit*, 78 *et seq.*

²⁴ He further points out that "a similar scheme was suggested by Johnson as practicable in 1774" (p. 81)

and correct their compositions upon maturer judgement and reflection, therefore Be it enacted by the authority aforesaid that from and after the said twenty-fourth day of June 1737, no author shall have power to sell, alienate, assign or transfer except by his last will and testament the right hereby vested in him to the original copy of any book, pamphlet or writing to any person or persons whatsoever for any longer time than ten years to commence from the date of such sale, alienation, assignment or transfer, and all sales, alienations, transfers, assignments and all covenants for any sale, alienation, assignment or transfer for any longer time or to commence from a future day, and all bargains and covenants for renewal of the same before the first term is expired, shall be utterly void and of none effect

The Bathurst papers are still in the possession of the family at Cirencester Park, Gloucestershire I have corresponded with the present Lord Bathurst, who takes a great interest in the papers and who arranged them for publication, and learn from him that this clause and endorsement are not in the hand of Allen, first Earl Bathurst He writes, however, that on the next page of the document, in the handwriting of Bathurst's second son, then an M P, this clause, labelled "Proviso added by the Lords," appears: "Provided always that after the Expiration of said term of fourteen years the sole right of printing or disposing of Copies shall return to the Authors thereof, if they are then living, for another term of fourteen years" This was not printed in the Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, but is of some value as evidence of the family interest in the bill I see little reason to doubt the attribution of the longer clause to Swift for he and Bathurst were close friends, the two were in correspondence, and Bathurst and his son would have been the likeliest members of the Lords and Commons to have been called upon by him to further the bill. That Swift was accustomed to advising Bathurst we can gather from a mock-complaint of the latter that he could never get letters from the Dean "except in Parliament-time about an Irish cause" ²⁵

It is a pity that Bathurst did not preserve his letters from Swift with the same care that Swift kept those of his friend, for several of Swift's have been lost while the originals of most of Bathurst's are to be found in the British Museum. It was an extremely interesting correspondence and were it more nearly complete, there is

²⁵ *Correspondence*, v, 232

strong likelihood that more light might be thrown on the minor part played by Swift in the long drawn out legal struggle over the copyright—the struggle that was all important in shaping the course of English authorship in modern times.

University of Washington

DONALD CORNU

HORACE WALPOLE AND EDMUND BURKE

Since Mr. Wilmarth S Lewis is now engaged in editing the correspondence of Horace Walpole with a completeness unknown to Cunningham or Mrs Toynbee, it is perhaps well to transcribe a hitherto unpublished letter of some intrinsic value. No letters between the master of Strawberry Hill and Edmund Burke are found in the previously published correspondence of either, although numerous allusions to Burke's oratory and public policies occur in Walpole's letters to intimate correspondents like Mason, Conway, and Lady Ossory. Recently by the kind permission of Earl Fitzwilliam I examined the private papers of Burke at Wentworth Woodhouse, Yorkshire, and found the following letter, endorsed in Burke's hand "Horace Walpole Dec. 3^d. 1777"

Arlington Street
Dec 3 1777.

I was extremely sorry, Sr, to be obliged to deny myself the pleasure of seeing you when you did me the honour of calling on me this morning I had just heard that Mr Acland was killed, & as He came in for Callington, where Ld & Lady Orford have the principal Interest, I had my Lord's Steward & Lawyer with me consulting on the necessary measures to be taken for keeping up my Unfortunate Nephew's Interest I flatter myself this will plead my excuse to you, Sr, since I was the only loser I should have had the honour of waiting on you myself before this Time, but knew you was much better employed, & intended to defer my visit to the Recess, when you might have leisure to receive so insignificant and old man as

yr most obedient
humble Ser^t
Hor Walpole

One senses that the tone of Walpole's apology is pitched somewhere between good manners and ironic humility. The fastidious son of Sir Robert naturally regarded the great Irish Whig as something of a parvenu and florid rhetorician; but on occasion he was

willing to grant admiration to Burke's wit and satire¹ Although in this note he professed to treat Burke's call as a mere social courtesy, Walpole probably suspected that it had something to do with the vacant seat in the Whig interest about which Walpole was even then closeted with the family steward and lawyer, and regarding which he wanted no interference² Major John Dyke Acland, to whose rumored death Walpole here alludes, had served as aide-de-camp to General Burgoyne at Saratoga, and news of that crushing defeat had just reached Walpole "on Tuesday night," 1 e December 2nd, according to his letter of December 4th to Sir Horace Mann However, after receiving a more reliable report of the casualties, Walpole was able to write to Lady Ossory late on the night of December 5th "Mr Acland is not dead, but wounded, and his poor wife [Lady Henrietta Fox, daughter of the first Earl of Ilchester] is gone to him at Saratoga, from Quebec." In writing to Burke, Walpole refers to the supposedly empty seat in the Commons and the controlling interest of "my Unfortunate Nephew" This was George Walpole, third Lord Orford, an erratic character whose more lucid activities were devoted to horseracing, ballooning, astronomy, and hawking, and who in the late spring of 1777 had lapsed into another fit of madness—leaving his uncle and ultimate successor as the guardian of his affairs One final detail in the annotation of this letter may be mentioned—that on the day it was written, and as another consequence of the same tidings from Saratoga, Burke was publicly insulted by the Solicitor-General in the House of Commons and was on the verge of a duel which seems to have escaped the notice of his biographers, though it soon came to the ears of Horace Walpole.³

¹ See for example his letter to the Countess of Ossory, 12 January, 1775 "Do I care for hearing how many ways Mr Burke can make a mosaic pavement or an inlaid cabinet? No! truly", similar touches of condescension might easily be cited On the other hand note his praise of Burke's satire which "almost suffocated Lord North himself with laughter," to Mason, February 12, 1778

² Burke's letter of December 9, 1777 to his political henchman in Bristol, Richard Champion, mentions Major Acland's participation at Saratoga and the correct report of his having been wounded, see *Burke Correspondence*, ed Fitzwilliam and Bourke (London, 1844), II, 203 The Whigs' concern in retaining their seat from Callington needs of course little proof

³ See "Burke's Prospective Duel," by the present writer, in *N. & Q.*, March 12, 1938, pp 186-7, and April 23, pp 296-7

I venture to say that one note, in the third person, from Edmund Burke to Horace Walpole, dated "Sunday morning, July 7, 1782," is the only known specimen of Burke's address to Walpole which survives. It was published by Cunningham in 1906 and ascribed somewhat carelessly to Burke's son Richard—although its contents and the presence of a letter written later the same day by Richard Burke to the same recipient show beyond much doubt that the initial missive came from the father.⁴ Both letters were written in the hope of persuading Walpole's brother, Sir Edward, to resign his lucrative sinecure as Clerk of the Pells to "a person under twenty-five years of age" who should pay him as a sort of annuity the entire profits during Sir Edward's lifetime. The scheme was inspired by the Burkes' imminent retreat from office, following the death of their patron, Rockingham, on the previous Monday, July 1, and it bears witness to a rather desperate stratagem by which Edmund Burke hoped to gain preferment for his son.⁵

DIXON WECTER

University of Colorado

"The request in the third person reads "Mr Burke presents his compliments to Mr Walpole, and will have the honour of waiting on Mr Walpole for the purpose of a few minutes' conversation with him at any hour he will please appoint this forenoon." The other letter, of the same date, is signed by Richard Burke, Jr, and begins "I took the liberty of calling on you this evening by my father's desire, he being confined at home by business, to trouble you with a second part of his conversation with you this morning." Young Burke goes on to request an interview with Walpole "in the morning"—thus plainly implying that the note of "Sunday morning" asking for an appointment with the writer that forenoon had come from Edmund Burke. The handwriting of the senior Burke is not unlike that of his son, as the present writer can testify from having read both among the Burke papers at Wentworth, and Cunningham's carelessness is excusable.

⁴ From Walpole's Journal, Lord Russell in his *Memoirs of O J Fox* (Philadelphia, 1853), I, 348-9, summarizes the episode anew "Walpole, after some intercourse and explanation with Burke, and through his son, convinced him that the proposal (which Walpole terms frantic) was quite inadmissible," and upon Walpole's authority he cites the rather discreditable rumor that the elder Burke, in view of such a plum of sinecure, had foreborne to prune away the perquisites of this office in his second Reform Bill. Eventually Richard Burke, who had been a deputy in his father's Pay Office in 1782 and again in 1783, obtained his sinecure, though without Walpole's aid. Sir Philip Magnus, who is preparing a biography

SOME SOURCES OF WORDSWORTH'S PASSAGES ON MYTHOLOGY

Several of the mythological passages in Wordsworth's *Excursion* Book IV are traceable in content and in their psychological approach to myth-making to *Purchas his Pilgrimage* by Samuel Purchas, 1614. (Item 285, second day of the sale of Wordsworth's library.)

Comparing in detail Purchas's description of the formation of Persian myths, with that in the *Excursion*, we find:

<i>Purchas</i>	<i>Wordsworth</i>
<p>Their custome is ascending up the highest hilles, to offer sacrifices to Iupiter Worshippers wearing their Tiara, girded about with myrtle (P 370)</p> <p>They have neither Images nor Altars they sacrifice in an high place, they thinke heaven to be Iupiter they worship the Sunne, whom they call <i>Mithra</i>, the Moone also and <i>Venus</i>, and the Fire, and the Earth, and the Windes (P 371)</p>	<p>Whether the Persian—zealous to reject Altar and image, and the inclusive walls And roofs of temples built by human hands— To loftiest heights ascending, from their tops, With myrtle-wreathed tiara on his brow, Presented sacrifice to moon and stars, And to the winds and mother elements, And the whole circle of the heavens. (<i>Excursion</i>, IV, 671-8)</p>

The same parallelism is to be found in the description of Babylonian worship. In explaining the construction of Babylon.

<i>Purchas</i>	<i>Wordsworth</i>
<p>the foure squares thereof contained sixteene miles a piece, where in every man had his Vineyard and Garden according to his degree wherewith to maintaine his family in time of siege (P 55)</p>	<p>and the city vast Of his devoted worshippers, far stretched, With grove and field and garden interspersed; Their town, and foodful region for support Against the pressure of beleaguering war (889-93)</p>

of Burke for publication in 1939, kindly informs me that in the J P Morgan Library there is a long MS. relating to the disposal of the Receiver-Generalship of the Land Revenues, awarded jointly to Richard Burke Jr and to Walker King in 1783

And of the tower built by Semiramis to the god Jupiter Belus:

Purchas

In the middest whereof is a solid Tower, of the height and thicknes of a furlong upon this another, and so on higher then another, eight in number (P 56)

In the highest Tower is a Chappell, and therein a faire bed covered, and a table of golde, without any Image Neyther, as the Chaldean Priests affirme, doth any abide here in the night, but one woman, whom this God shall appoint They say the God himselfe there lieth (P 56)

Wordsworth

And, from the plain, with toil immense, upreared
Tower eight times planted on the top of tower (684-5)

That Belus, nightly to his splendid couch

Descending, there might rest.
(686-7)

And again of the Chaldeans, whom Purchas identifies with the Egyptians because they are both descendents of Cham:

Purchas

But first of all other the Egyptians began to behold and adore the heavenly bodies and because they were not covered with houses for the temperature of the ayre, and that Region is not subiect to clouds, they observed the motions and eclipses of the stars, and whiles they often viewed them more curiously, fell to worship them

(P 53)

Wordsworth

Beneath the concave of unclouded skies

Spread like a sea, in boundless solitude,

Looked on the polar star, as on a guide

And guardian of their course, that never closed

His steadfast eye (695-99)

and thus

Led on, those shepherds made report of stars

In set rotation passing to and fro,
Between the orbs of our apparent sphere (709-11)

With a submissive reverence they beheld. (700)

Another passage in the same book¹ evidently comes from Francis Rous's *Archaeologiae Atticae*, 1642 (Item 233, first day of sale).

¹ Inconclusively traced by Mr Douglas Bush in "Notes on Keats's Reading," *PMLA*, L, and in *Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry*, p 80, to Potter's *Archaeologia Graeca*.

Rous

cutting off their hair and sac-
rificing it to rivers, as Cephisus.
(P 48)

Wordsworth

This severed hair,
My vow fulfilling, do I here present,
Thankful for my beloved child's re-
turn
Thy banks, Cephisus, he again hath
trod (746-9)

The University of Wisconsin

ELISABETH K. HOLMES

POE'S DR. PERCIVAL

A NOTE ON *THE FALL OF THE HOUSE OF USHER*

With unfailing unanimity annotators of "The Fall of the House of Usher" have found the contemporary American poet, James Gates Percival (1795-1856), in Poe's note concerning the "other men" holding an opinion "of the sentience of all vegetable things." Specious support of this identification has been found in Percival's brief medical career. Not only did the poet Percival not express an opinion on this topic, but an examination of his scientific writings reveals an antipathy to this sort of theorizing. Percival taught for a few months at the United States Military Academy, yet Poe seems not to have known of him and never mentioned his poetry, although until 1832 Percival was generally ranked first among American poets.

Poe's note gave the source of his information and made possible a correct identification, but, despite the erudite examination of Roderick Usher's library, hitherto this book has not been investigated. The note is: "Watson, Dr. Percival, Spallanzani, and especially the Bishop of Llandaff.—See *Chemical Essays*, vol. v." Easily recognized were Lazzaro Spallanzani (1729-1799), the Italian scientist and traveler; and Richard Watson (1737-1816), the Bishop of Llandaff, friend of Franklin, professor of divinity in Trinity College, Cambridge, and author of five volumes of *Chemical Essays* (1781-1787). These writings remained popular many years, when and how Poe became acquainted with them is not known. Many botanists discussed the theory of the perceptivity of plants, Poe may have become familiar with the idea through his miscellaneous reading. Yet the combination of names and the ascription of a specific source make the identification unmistakable.

In 1771 Watson printed for private distribution *An Essay on the Subjects of Chemistry, and Their General Division*, in which he stated "It should be well weighed by the metaphysicians, whether they can exclude vegetables from the faculty of perception, by other than by comparative arguments"¹ As examples to support his theory he cited the heliotrope's daily turning round with the sun and the inclination of young trees in a forest toward that part through which light penetrates. Watson concluded:

Now to refer the muscular motions of shell fish, and zoophytes, to an internal principle of volition, to make them indicative of the perceptivity of the being, and to attribute the more notable ones of vegetables, to certain mechanical dilatations, and contractions of parts occasioned by external impulse, is to err against that rule of philosophy which assigns the same causes for the effects of the same kind"²

In reprinting this essay in Volume v of his *Chemical Essays* (London, 1787), Watson added a seven-page preface to demonstrate that his opinion had not "that novelty to recommend or disgrace it, which, when I wrote the Essay, I thought belonged to it"³ Five authors are mentioned in support of the theory and three in opposition. "I am pleased," Watson first remarked, "to see that so able a writer as Dr Percival has supported the same side of the question."⁴ Then Watson marshaled four quotations from earlier writers. one in Greek from Joannes Stobæus (5th Cent.), one each in Latin from Girolamo Cardano (1501-1576) and from John Ray (1628-1705), and one in English from Spallanzani's *Dissertations Relative to the Natural History of Animals and Vegetables* (London, 1784), a translation of *Dissertationi di Fisica Animale, e Vegetabile* (Modena, 1780).

From Poe's use of this acknowledged source, it is obvious that he mentioned only those authorities whose words were intelligible to him. Ignorance of Latin and Greek, as he once declared, was no sin, but in this instance he did not indulge in pretence. He did not pad his note. Yet, curiously, Poe mentioned Watson's name and title much as if two persons were meant. Since the title page of *Chemical Essays* makes no reference to Watson's office as bishop, Poe may have used this peculiar means for emphasis. Whatever the motive, he made honest acknowledgment of his obligation.

¹ Watson, Richard, *Chemical Essays* (London, 1781-1787), v 138

² *Ibid.*, v, 142.

³ *Ibid.*, v, 103.

⁴ *Ibid.*, v, 103.

Poe's Dr. Percival, it is now clear, must be Dr. Thomas Percival (1740-1804), physician and author, who practiced in Manchester, England, from 1765 until his death. Today he is esteemed for *Medical Ethics* (1803), although a work for juveniles, *A Father's Instruction* (1775-1800), attracted wide attention in its day.⁵ His essay on the sensitivity of plants was contributed to the *Memoirs of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society* (1785), II, 114. There is no evidence that Poe saw this work.

University of Maryland

HARRY R. WARFEL

SEE MYCHE, SAY LYTELL, AND LERNE TO SOFFER IN TYME

Among the hitherto unprinted poems which MacCracken includes in the second volume of *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate* (pp. 800-801) is a rather pleasing piece in five stanzas rime royal with the title "See Much, Say Little, and Learn to Suffer in Tyme." Judged by literary, linguistic or metrical tests, these verses afford no decisive evidence as to their authorship. They are assigned to the Monk of Bury solely on the authority of the ascription to him which Stow added later to his text of the poem in B. M. Addit. 29729, a MS written in 1558. But just as almost every unattached religious poem in the fourteenth century was fathered on Richard Rolle, so the steady pull of literary gravitation led scribes and editors to affix the Lydgate label to a considerable body of fifteenth-century material without any substantial evidence.

On the other hand, Corp. Chr. Coll. Oxf. MS 203 preserves a tradition as to the authorship of this piece which carries back at least to the second half of the fifteenth century. In this manuscript the text of the "See Much, Say Little" verses bears the heading "Proverbrum R. Stokys" (p. 203). Who was R. Stokys?

There was a Richard Stoke who was appointed with Geoffrey Chaucer and two others on May 16, 1387, "to enquire who ravished and abducted Isabella dau. and heir of William atte Halle" etc. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1385-1389*, p. 326). Two years later, Richard Stokes—presumably the same person—was appointed one

⁵ *DNB*, XLIV, 383-384.

of the barons of the Exchequer (*Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1388-1392*, p. 29). And on Feb 15, 1396, Richard Stokes, Lewis Clifford and four others were appointed to audit the account of the treasurer and receiver-general of the late Queen Anne, etc. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1391-1396*, p. 689). The auditing of this account seems to have been a protracted business, for his name appears again, this time associated with Philip la Vache, Knt., in two later appointments for the same purpose, Oct. 20, 1397, and Apr 10, 1399 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1396-1399*, pp. 245 and 518).

Perhaps the most convincing testimony as to the value of his services appears (Oct 9, 1398) in a "Grant for life or until further order to Richard de Stokes, one of the barons of the Exchequer, for good service to the king's father [i. e. the Black Prince] and mother and to the king in the office of the auditor of accounts, of 10 l a year from the issues of the lordship of South Wales" (*Cal Pat. Rolls Rich. II, 1396-1399*, p. 424). The mention in this Grant of the service which Stokes had rendered to the Black Prince enables us to identify him without question with the Richard Stokes who is named in a series of entries in the *Black Prince's Register* from 1359 to 1364:

- Oct 25, 1359, a Commission issued to Rich de Stokes and two others to audit the accounts of all the Prince's chamberlains, receivers, bailiffs, reeves and other accountable ministers in England, Wales, Cornwall and the County of Chester (*Register*, Part iv, p 328)
- Oct 23, 1361, Sir Richard de Stok, chaplain, presented by the Black Prince to the Church of Duddecote (*Register*, Part iv, p 398)
- Jan 10, 1362, Orders recorded to the Prince's clerks, Sir Richard de Stokes and Sir John de Carleton (*Register*, Part iv, p 410).
- March 26, 1362, a Commission issued to Stokes and the other two persons named in the Commission of Oct 25, 1359, to audit the accounts as previously specified (*Register*, Part iv, p 428).
- April 1363, July 6, 1363, and Nov 1364 Sir Richard de Stokes again mentioned as the Prince's clerk (*Register*, Part iv, pp 490, 503 and 539).

The dates of his service in this capacity make it evident that Richard Stokys must have been approximately of the same age as Chaucer, and on one occasion, as we have seen, he held an appointment along with Chaucer himself. Moreover, we find him more than once associated with Chaucer's friends, Lewis Clifford and Philip Vache.

It would be pleasant if we could connect the "See Myche, Sey

Lytell" poem with a man who moved in the outer fringes, at least, of the Chaucerian circle. The difficulty of identifying him, however, is much increased by the number of persons bearing this name who are mentioned in documents of the closing years of the fourteenth and the early decades of the fifteenth centuries

Richard Stoke, clerk, Nov 2, 1398 (*Cal Close Rolls 1396-1399*, p 350).

Richard Stok, Feb 16, 1415 (*Cal Fine Rolls 1413-1422*, Vol xiv, p 101)

Richard Stokes, parson of Great Billyng, Northants, Jan 7, 1394 (*Cal Fine Rolls*, Vol xi, p 107)

Richard Stokes, Vicar of St Mary Abbots, Kensington, 1391 to 1394/5 (*Hennessey's Newcourt*)

Rich Stokys in the Folio *Calendar Rotul Patent John to Edward IV*, p 217, col 2

Robert Stokys, prior of the monastery of Ivy Church in the diocese of Salisbury, resigned May 1467 (*Cal Pat Rolls Edw IV-Henry VI*, 1467-77, p 15)

Roger Stokes, one of the wardens of the Fraternity of St James at Garlickhethe London in 1389 (See Toulmin Smith, *Gilds*, pp 3-5, and Chambers and Daunt, *London English*, p 44)

Without further evidence, it would be futile to attempt to pick out from the eligible possibilities above listed the "R. Stokys" who is credited with the Proverbium. The difficulty involved in selecting from super-abundance does not, however, justify us in setting aside the explicit testimony of a fifteenth-century manuscript and accepting instead the assignment to "Lidgat" which Stow subsequently added in his manuscript. For, as MacCracken himself remarks, "Stow, while deserving all our gratitude, has no great claim to credit on the question of authorship" (*Minor Poems of Lydgate*, p. xxxix, note).

CARLETON BROWN

New York University

WIFE OF BATH'S TALE 1159-62

For gentillesse nys but renomee
Of thyne auncestres for hire heigh bountee,
Which is a strange thyng to thy persone—
Thy gentillesse cometh fro God allone¹

Brusendorff says² "It is quite clear that the sense of D 1159

¹ Manly's text, *Canterbury Tales*, N. Y., 1928, p. 306

² *The Chaucer Tradition*, London, 1925, p. 475

runs completely contrary to that of the context, only if *nys but* be taken, not in the usual ME. sense *is only*, but in the directly opposite meaning, commonly expressed by *nis noon*, it becomes possible to reconcile D 1159 with the rest of the passage." On this Manly comments,³ "Brusendorff's idea that these lines run contrary to the context, and require *but* to be taken in the sense of *noon* rests on a failure to follow the course of the thought. Chaucer is contrasting the conventional, false idea of *gentillesse* with the true."

Brusendorff's discussion, however, shows that he is not unaware of the course of the thought. Granted Chaucer's obvious distinction between true and false *gentillesse*, still he is in the habit of using words in their accepted contemporary senses, and after making the Loathly Lady say,

Crist wole we clayme of hym oure gentillesse,
Nat of oure eldres for hire old richesse,
For thogh they yeve us al hir heritage,
For which we clayme to been of heigh parage,
Yet may they nat biquethe for nothyng
To noon of us hir vertuous lyvyng,
That made hem gentilmen ycalled be,

it is, to say the least, puzzling to the reader when Chaucer follows, without warning us of complete reversal in the sense of *gentillesse*, with the statement,

For gentillesse nys but renomee
Of thyne auncestres for hire heigh bountee⁴

In the passage in which the Lady contrasts true *gentillesse* with false (D 1109-64), Chaucer uses the word *gentillesse* seven times, and its synonym *genterye* twice, besides *gentilman* (thrice) and *gentil* (four times), uniformly in the corresponding sense. I believe we have no right to assume any but the usual sense of *gentillesse* without plain indication on Chaucer's part; as to assume the sense 'false *gentillesse*' I think we have such plain indication in two places; at the beginning of our passage (1109 f.) we find '*swich gentillesse* As is descended out of old richesse' clearly defining the false kind claimed by the Knight and others like him (cf *ye* 1109, 1111).⁵

³ Manly, p 585

⁴ D 1117-23; 1159-60.

⁵ The term *verray gentillessee* (1163) at the end of the passage is used in contrast, not to the use of the word in the other five occurrences

The second instance in which the word is defined as the false type is that in which the Knight's individual spurious gentillesse is limited by the specific pronoun *thy* (1160-62). Since the difference between *thou* and *ye* in addressing one person was habitual and largely unconscious, their use often indicated slight differences of mood, attitude, or circumstances not immediately evident to the modern reader. But it would be hazardous, for Chaucer's time, to assume that the forms were ever used indiscriminately. It seems probable, for instance, that the Lady's use of *thou* (*thee, thy*) in 1054-66 reflects her sense of mastery over the Knight (note especially the combination *thee, sir knyght*, 1054). After the wedding, the Lady uses the polite *ye* to her new husband (1087-97). In his blunt reply (1100-2) to her question (1096 f.) the Knight uses *thou* in disgust at her ugliness, age, and low rank. Unabashed, she continues the use of the polite *ye* (1108 f., 1146). But at the climax of her argument regarding gentillesse the Lady matches the Knight's *thou* in his condemnation of her (1100 f.) with three emphatic *thy*'s (1160-2). The matter of rank was the most important of the Knight's objections, and from here on, the Lady adheres to *ye* in discussing her supposed poverty, age, and ugliness.

In the passage quoted at the head of this article, it is clear that the Lady brings her argument about true gentillesse to a point in a telling personal application to the Knight, made unmistakable by the three occurrences of *thy*. This makes obvious the inconsistency that readers of Chaucer have long found in the passage:

For gentillesse nys but renomee
Of *thyne* auncestres for hire heigh bountee

But l. 1159 is not the only one of which the normal meaning is flatly contradictory to the Lady's course of thought. In the present text l. 1162 reads:

Thy gentillesse cometh fro God allone

From the foregoing it is clear that by *thy gentillesse* the Lady means the Knight's own type of (false) gentillesse on which he piques himself. The statement is therefore exactly the reverse

where it is undefined, with ordinary meaning, but to *swich gentillesse* at the beginning, as an effective ending of the whole argument

of her preceding statements in 1117 f ('Crist wole we clayme of hymn oure gentillesse') and 1129 ff. If the Knight's own gentillesse (what else can *thy gentillesse* mean?) comes from God alone, it is the genuine sort, not the spurious kind she is accusing him of entertaining.

Both these contradictions are removed, and the argument becomes wholly clear and consistent if we exchange *For gentillesse* (1159) and *Thy gentillesse* (1162)

Thy gentillesse nys but renomee
Of thyne auncestres for hire heigh bountee
(Which is a strange thyng to thy persone),
For gentillesse cometh fro God allone

This brings together where they belong the three *thy's* in their strictly personal application to the Knight. 'Your own kind of gentillesse is nothing but your ancestors' reputation for high character (in which you yourself appear strangely lacking), for gentillesse comes from God alone (through Godly living, 1173 ff.).'⁶

Professor Manly has kindly communicated to me that the proposed exchange of *For* and *Thy* is not evidenced in the extant MSS, and agrees that such assumed mistake must be attributed to a parent MS. He does mention, indeed, that in 1162 seventeen MSS read *The* for *Thy*, and this indicates to me at least some scribal effort to remove the flat contradiction of this line, and a not altogether unsuccessful one. In the main, however, I propose the emendation as one without textual support, and worthy at least of consideration because it removes two contradictions not yet explained, and because of its perfect fitness to the trend of the Lady's argument.

There are, it is true, a few textual probabilities in its favor. In the scribe's rapid glancing back and forth from the original to his copy, his eye may have caught down *For* from immediately above (1158). Then, both phrases *Thy gentillesse* and *For gentillesse* having already caught his eye, by the well-known spooneristic tendency to compensating error, having already written *For*

⁶The juxtaposition of the two generalizations in 1162 and 1163 is not a difficulty. The first gives the basis for the three immediately preceding lines, while the second clinches the whole argument from 1109, with *verray gentillesse* corresponding to *such gentillesse* at the beginning.

gentillesse, he next writes the other, *Thy gentillesse*, in 1162. It is even possible, and perhaps more probable, that Chaucer himself unconsciously made the exchange in the original draft

JOHN S KENYON

Hiram College

A FURTHER NOTE ON DORIGEN'S *EXEMPLA*

In an article on "Chaucer at work on the complaint in the *Franklin's Tale*,"¹ I discussed the significance of the following gloss, or rather series of glosses, placed in El opposite F 1455-64, that is, at the end of the complaint.

Memorandum Strato regulus

Vidi & omnes pene Barbares capitulo xxvi primi

Item Cornelia &c

Imitentur ergo nupte Theanam Cleobiliam Gorgim (or Gorgum) Thy-modian Claudias atque Cornelias in fine libri primi

Singulas has historias & plures hanc materiam concernentes recitat beatus Ieronimus contra Iovinianum in primo suo libro, capitulo 39^o ²

I am grateful to Professor Manly for calling my attention to the presence, and—more important—to the position in five MSS of the last of these El glosses, *Singulas has historias*, etc. In Bo², En³, Hg, and Ht, it starts opposite F 1395, and in Dd, opposite 1392, thus either at or very near the end of the third of Dorigen's *exempla*,³ that is, at a point where we had noted a change in Chaucer's treatment of his material ⁴ as well as a first shifting from chap. 41 of *Adversus Iovinianum* (dealing with virtuous virgins) to chap. 43 (on chaste wives). All this suggests that the position of the gloss in those five MSS may reflect a first and very short form of the complaint. It is true that F 1364-68 seem to indicate that Chaucer, at the start, had planned to give *exempla* of chaste

¹ *MLN*, LII (1937), 16-23

² Quoted p 20, in the page composition the end of the last gloss was accidentally placed between footnotes 6 and 7. Corrected, p 620, *errata*

³ The only other MSS where it has been found are Ad³, Ha¹, and Ps. In Ad³ it is preceded by the glosses on *Strato*, *omnes pene Barbares*, and *Cornelia*, and starts opposite F 1458, thus nearly as in El. In Ha¹ and Ps, it is copied as part of the text, following the gloss of 30th *Atheniensium*. . . after F 1378

⁴ P. 21.

wives as well as of virgins, but it would not seem improbable that this task, subsequently carried out in such a perfunctory and careless way, began to tire him as early as F 1395. Indeed, F 1395-98,

Now sith that maydens hadden swich despit
To been defouled with mannes foul delit,
Wel oghte a wyf rather hirselveslee
Than be defouled, as it thynketh me,

seem meant not as a transition to a new series of *exempla* but rather as a reversion to Dorigen's own case. The passage may very well have been written with the intention of rounding off the complaint at this point.

GERMAINE DEMPSTER

Chicago

REVIEWS

A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Poems. Edited by HYDER E. ROLLINS. New York and London: Lippincott, 1938. Pp. xvi + 667. \$7.50.

Shakespeare's poems, edited by Professor Hyder E. Rollins, form the text for the newest volume of the Variorum Shakespeare, the second to be issued under the auspices of the Modern Language Association of America. Omitting the *Sonnets*, already edited adequately by the late Raymond M. Alden, Rollins presents *Venus and Adonis*, *Lucrece*, *The Passionate Pilgrim*, *The Phoenix and the Turtle*, and *A Lover's Complaint*. Each of the five has its own bibliographical, historical, and critical problems since each was originally published in separate form. This has made editing much more onerous as textual questions alone called for minute examination and collation by Rollins of seventy-five early quartos and octavos besides many later versions. All verbal variations are carefully recorded in the textual notes, while larger differences are explained in the Appendix. Bibliographically, the book is a monument to expert editorial labor.

Critical and explanatory notes, placed as usual in the Variorum immediately below the text, show both learning and discretion. If any relevant printed interpretation has been overlooked, I have failed to catch the omission. Probably any reader would have glossed certain unexplained lines. Personally, I was struck by marked similarity of phrasing between lines in both *Venus* and *Lucrece* and

other lines in Act II of *Romeo*. A more serious complaint is that spatial limitations combined with editorial modesty to prevent Rollins from expressing his own judgment on many matters controversial

A specific instance where annotation is almost completely lacking concerns a few lines from *Lucrece* about the painting of a scene from the Trojan War. Digressing momentarily from her denunciation of Helen of Troy, the Roman matron soliloquizes.

Let sinne alone committed, light alone
Vppon his head that hath transgressed so
Let guiltlesse soules be freed from guilty woe,
For ones offence why should so many fall?
To plague a private sinne in generall (Lines 1480-4)

The one explanatory note is that cited from Sidney Lee to the last line "To make the sin of an individual a plague for the whole public." But surely Lee misses the point, and the surprise is that neither Carleton Brown nor the learned Harvard editor has seized upon the passage as flat heresy opposing the Christian doctrine of Original Sin. I know of no similar outburst in all Shakespeare.

Most scholars will find the most valuable portion of the book to lie in the Appendix of some two hundred and fifty finely printed pages. There besides the important textual histories Rollins gives detailed excerpts of opinion concerning possible sources and dates, and the authenticity of the minor poems, with specific information concerning popularity of the two major ones. That Shakespeare in his dedication of the 1593 *Venus* termed it "the first heire of my invention," led many early critics to the conclusion that the poem preceded all writing for the stage. Such opinions are no longer held, but Rollins stresses the point that Shakespeare believed that his literary reputation would rest on his poems rather than his plays. The thirty-page discussion of "The Vogue of *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*" is an illuminating history of literary taste and the varying canons of criticism. But we miss the striking prophecy of W. J. Rolfe in his preface to the poems (1883): "The text is given without expurgation . . . Of course, these poems will never be read in schools or 'Shakespeare clubs.'"

Another interesting chapter, in which Rollins is especially qualified to speak, is that concerning William Jaggard's part in the piratical printing of *The Passionate Pilgrim* and its attribution to Shakespeare. Rollins, writing this time on his own authority, meets effectively Captain Jaggard's defence of his ancestor. Comments on the authorship of *A Lover's Complaint* are divided into criticisms before and after 1912, the date of Mackail's careful study of the style and evolution of the poem. Mackail attributed authorship to a rival of Shakespeare. Rollins remains skeptical.

Twelve pages are devoted to a convenient list of musical settings for the poems "prepared by . . . Roy Lamson, Jr." The bibliography is slightly briefer and better than those in most other

volumes, and the Index is correspondingly larger and more serviceable. But among living authors one misses from this Index the name of Hardin Craig.

One striking impression created by the entire book is the relative emphasis placed upon present-day criticism and contemporary investigation, particularly in the scholarly magazines of America and the continent. One name constantly repeated is that of Kittredge, to whom the editor acknowledges a large debt. Books published within this decade are freely quoted. As a whole, the volume will undoubtedly stand as one of the best of the Variorums and far above any other edition of the *Poems* now in print or soon to be.

ROBERT ADGER LAW

The University of Texas

Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary By JOSEPH MERSAND. Brooklyn, New York, 1937. The Comet Press. XIV + 173 pp. (New York University Dissertation).

The Place of Group F in the Canterbury Chronology By LAURENCE FAULKNER HAWKINS. New York, 1937. Published by the Author. VI + 57 pp. (New York University Dissertation).

Medieval English Domestic Life and Amusements in the Works of Chaucer. By SISTER MARY ERNESTINE WHITMORE, A. M. Washington, D. C., 1937. The Catholic University of America. (Catholic University Dissertation).

The three monographs here listed are academic dissertations; and very creditable specimens they are. They would never be mistaken for the ripe and humane theses which we associate with the French *docteur ès lettres* or for German *Habilitationsschriften*, but they do exemplify American Ph. D. theses of the better sort. The authors are well-trained young scholars who know their trade, solid, methodical, and scrupulously honest. And that, I maintain, is all we have a right to expect. Now and then, to be sure, a brilliant student does the sort of thing our Humanist friends demand, a little more often one or another may solve for good some purely linguistic problem, but to ask these things as conditions for granting the Ph. D. degree is to ask for the moon—and quite unnecessary. Given scholarship and method, which it should be the business—the only business—of our graduate schools to impart—we may safely leave the greater achievements to time and mother wit.

Two of the studies under review come from Professor Carleton's Brown's seminar in Chaucer at New York University, and both

show unmistakable marks of the master. Of the two, Mr. Mersand's *Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary* is the more important, for here for the first time we have a painstaking count of the Romanic words in Chaucer and dependable tables with which hereafter it will be possible to operate. But Mr. Mersand's generalizations seem often hasty and ill-founded. For instance, one might infer from his criticism of his predecessors that their conclusions concerning Chaucer's language are wrong, or, at least, misleading. It turns out, however, on the basis of Mr. Mersand's own tables, that their generalization that Chaucer wrote, in Lounsbury's words, "in the speech of his time," is quite correct. Macaulay's remarks on the language of Gower and Chaucer rest certainly on inadequate statistical evidence, but they clearly wrote the same language, and the proportion of Romance words is almost identical in both. The same thing holds for Mandeville. Of course Chaucer used twice as many Romance words as Gower and three times as many as Mandeville, but Chaucer's total vocabulary, naturally enough, is twice that of Gower and three times that of Mandeville. The proportions, therefore, are constant. What better vindication could Tyrwhitt and Marsh and Lounsbury ask? Mr. Mersand does show, however, that the number of French words apparently used by Chaucer for the first time is larger than has generally been supposed, far larger than the number introduced by Gower, even when allowance is made for the greater volume of Chaucer's English works. Of great interest, too, are the careful statistics of the French words in the various poems, including the several *Canterbury Tales*, but they seem too slight to support the conclusions which Mr. Mersand sometimes seeks to draw from them—concerning the date of the *Man of Laws Tale*, for example, or the English sources of the *Reeve's Tale*, the *Shipman's Tale*, and the *Friar's Tale*.

But for all that, *Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary* is a useful and solid piece of work. Mr. Hawkins' dissertation is less impressive. His thesis is that the tales of Group F (the *Squire's Tale* and the *Franklin's Tale*) are early—earlier than the *Merchant's Tale* and the *Wife of Bath's Tale*—and therefore cannot form part of a marriage debate. Now I cannot say that the argument is very convincing, but then, few arguments concerning the chronology of Chaucer's works are. I cannot for the life of me understand why a given set of literary reminiscences, or a few, usually quite general, verbal parallels, prove that certain works belong together. Chaucer, after all, had a memory, conscious and sub-conscious, he had manuscripts, and, above all, he had certainly at least ordinary mental elasticity. Men of genius are not adding machines. Still, it may be that the *Squire's Tale* belongs to the period of *Palamon*, and preceded the *Anelida* and the *Troilus*; and that the *Franklin's Tale* followed these closely in time. But I cannot see that this chronology has the slightest relevance to the

problem of the *Marriage Group*. What difference does it make when the tales were written, if they do in fact bear on the question of "maistrie" in marriage? And I find it difficult to understand how anyone can read Groups DEF and deny the fact. The *Wife of Bath* advances a certain thesis, her tale illustrates it, and the *Franklin's Tale* is the sufficient reply and the right solution. Whether Professor Kittredge is right in his wonderfully vivid reconstruction of the intervening drama is another matter. Very likely he often goes beyond the text. But the debate is there. And the *Franklin's Tale* closes it perfectly. The prologue is so clearly a reply to the thesis of the wife that one would think that it was only necessary to read it to be convinced. The tale proper, certainly, is a *demande*. Which of the three characters exhibited the greatest "gentillesse?" But "gentillesse" is the solution of the problem of the right relations of husband and wife in marriage. The date of composition of these tales is immaterial. It is, strictly speaking, immaterial, whether DEF represents Chaucer's final arrangement, though I see no reason to doubt that it does: the thing that matters is that Mr. Kittredge's hypothesis does work without forcing the text.

Sister Mary Ernestine's dissertation (Catholic University) is a more modest affair. Her whole concern has been to illustrate from Chaucer's works, with generous use of ancillary material, the life and amusements of English men and women in the fourteenth century. It was a happy idea, and the writer has carried it out with painstaking industry. She has not, however, succeeded in raising her work, for all the fascinating material at her command, much above the level of a catalogue. One thinks regretfully of Jusserand and Salzman and Coulton, and what they would have done with a subject like this. But of course the comparison is not fair. Some day, I hope, when Sister Mary Ernestine has come to live in Medieval England, and her rich materials have blossomed into a life of their own, she will write the book of which this dissertation is but the prolegomena. In this book she will not call Mr. Manly *James*, spell *marshal* "marshall," explain "a maner deye" as the dairymaid of manor! nor fall into the jargon of second-rate journalism, as when she speaks of a "home" when all she means is a house, or tell us that Chaucer, like some theatrical producer, "presents" the portrait of a castle. (P. 2).

University of Minnesota

M. B. RUUD.

Thomas More. By R. W. CHAMBERS. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1935. Pp. 416

At this date, it would be an act of supererogation to review Professor R. W. Chambers' scholarly biography, *Thomas More*, without consideration of his response to his critics in *The Place*

of *St. Thomas More in English Literature and History*. But since Professor Chambers' defense does not there modify the position taken in the biography, it is still proper and essential to turn to the fuller statement.

No previous biographer has brought a richer background to the task. He has made use of sources ignored or inaccessible a decade ago, but now through his encouragement made available: the 1857 edition of More's English works, the correspondence, and the biographies of More by William Roper, Nicholas Harpsfield, Thomas Stapleton, and "Ro. Ba." Primarily he has sought to restore the good name of More. The essence of his defense appeared first in his British Academy Lecture of 1926, *The Saga and Myth of Sir Thomas More*, in which he conclusively and brilliantly cleared More of a reputation as old as Burnet's *History of the Reformation* that he had set up in *Utopia* an ideal of religious tolerance only to deny his ideal later in life by persecuting heretics. By proving that the charge of persecution was unfounded, Chambers showed that there is no reason to doubt the consistency of More's thought and practice. The present biography reemphasizes and extends this point of view. Chambers argues conclusively that More's *Utopia*, far from being prophetic, as many of its commentators have supposed, is really reactionary, mediaeval. The *Utopia* is not perfect; it is only as perfect a state as is possible for pagans who are ignorant of the Christian virtues. Utopians are tolerant of heretics so long as they believe in Divine Providence and the future life, and do not incite others to sedition.

The significant result of Professor Chambers' work is to correct the traditional perspective of biased Protestant biographers by means of the testimony of More's Catholic contemporaries, though between these two positions, Professor Chambers has not taken a wholly neutral stand. Nowhere in the book is his point of view more apparent than in his presentation of Henry VIII as the opponent of Humanism in the latter half of his reign. Chambers' conception of "Henrician tyranny" is strongly influenced by an essay published twenty-five years ago in the *Dublin Review*, "Blessed Thomas More and the Arrest of Humanism in England" by J. S. Phillimore. On the whole, this essay misrepresents, sometimes seriously, the part Henry played in More's career and destiny, and in the course of Humanism in the sixteenth century. Phillimore advances the theses that

the Humanist movement in England was arrested at the middle of the sixteenth century and did not mature till more than a century later, that the movement was typically personified in More; and that his death was the blow which paralyzed it¹

While Professor Chambers has the good taste to avoid Phillimore's

¹ *The Dublin Review*, 153 (July, 1913), 1. Cf. Chambers, 379n: "a vital essay, to which every student of More is under a heavy debt."

prejudices,² and is certainly far from dismissing *Utopia* as a "youthful fancy," he accepts the theses. The cause for the arrest in Chambers' view is Henry's stale-mating or execution of Erasmus, Vives, Wolsey, Reynolds, Fisher, and More. These scholars and patrons of learning out of the way, the arrest of Humanism follows. Professor Chambers is careful at one point (p. 84) to limit his definition of Humanism to the study of Latin and Greek. Yet even if one accepts a definition so narrow, certainly the brightness of the humanistic outlook in the time of Erasmus's visits to England in the second decade of the century cannot have been darkened as effectually as Professor Chambers implies. Was Henry's loss of enthusiasm for Humanism coincident with his taking up of executions? And did these acts arrest Humanism in the subsequent period up to Elizabeth's reign? Cruel and perhaps unjust as was Henry's conduct toward the martyrs,—and I do not intend to discuss the political expediency of his acts—I do not perceive that Professor Chambers has proved thereby that the growth of Humanism in England suffered generally a serious check.

On the contrary, it can be shown that, far from being impeded in the later years of the reign, the study of the classics received notable encouragement from Henry himself and from Cromwell, his chief minister. In a recent paper,³ Professor Douglas Bush shows that at least at the universities, the study of the classics continued and expanded. There is further evidence that, outside the university walls, whatever shock was sustained by the death of More and Fisher did not deter the growth of classical studies. Professor Chambers has thrown much light on the intellectual group which grew up about Sir Thomas More. But the dispersal of this group must not be overestimated. Less known, but certainly as significant for the later development of Humanism was the little band of English scholars who gathered around Reginald Pole in Padua and Venice, supported by patrons in England, not least of whom was Thomas Cromwell. *Passim* in the *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, the record of this group may be traced. Lupset was one of them, Starkey another, others less known, all carrying on the English tradition of study in Italy. With scholars in England, they maintained correspondence. European scholars of international fame corresponded with them, visited them.

² Phillimore surveys the learning of the Elizabethan age with obvious contempt. Ben Jonson has a "provincial smattering . . . at about the level which Italy had reached 200 years before." The Elizabethan translations are proof that "Humanism in England remained marking time at the primary stage for three generations or more"; Elizabethan poetry, that "a barbaric people may have great poetry, they cannot have great prose." No mention of Sidney, Hooker, Bacon or the sermon writers. Chambers confines the arrest to the period before Spenser and Sidney. See p. 379.

³ "Tudor Humanism and Henry VIII," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, III (Jan. 1938), 162-177.

Regularly from their ranks were solicited the intellectual advisers of the crown. Pole feared his fate in England and remained abroad, but others of the group placed their learning at Henry's disposal. The career of one of these recruits, Richard Morison, illustrates the continuity and community of Humanism throughout the period of "arrest."⁴ He was a warm admirer of Wolsey, a personal friend of William Gonell, tutor to More's children, and of Thomas Cranmer, before his elevation to the archbishopric. His writing is steeped in classical learning, especially Plato and Plutarch, but includes also Dante, Chaucer, Vives (whose name Chambers links with More's as a "reactionary." *Sage and Myth*, 32, *Thomas More*, 259), Machiavelli, and Erasmus, whom he calls "the greatest lerned man of our tyme" Even during the busy years as ambassador to Charles V, he found time in each day to read the classics, and occasionally Ochino and Machiavelli, with his secretary, Roger Ascham, the future tutor of languages to Elizabeth Here certainly is clear evidence of the continuity of the Humanistic tradition from the latter half of Henry's reign to the "glories" of Elizabeth's.

Furthermore, Morison's career was not unique. Scholars like Starkey and Lupset carried on the same Humanistic tradition on their return to England, encouraged by the direct support of Henry and Cromwell. The loss incurred by More's execution should not be minimized. On the other hand, it must not be supposed that the execution of More meant the arrest of Humanism. For after all, Humanism was not an exclusively Catholic nor an exclusively Protestant tradition. Professor Chambers has latterly denied maintaining that the Reformation was a complete breach in continuity.⁵ There is no evidence that "the religious quarrel," in spite of the execution of More and Fisher, represents even an "arrest"

W. GORDON ZEEVELD

University of Maryland

The King's Household in the Arthurian Court from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Malory. By SISTER IMOGENE BAKER. Washington, D. C., 1937. (Catholic Univ. of America diss.)

The author of this dissertation announces it as her purpose to "study the presentation of the motif of the king's household in the chronicle and romance sources of English Arthurian tradition and to note its continuity or recurrence as a literary convention" More concretely she asks herself to what extent Arthur's court resembled

⁴ In a forthcoming article, I shall describe his importance in the Humanistic tradition

⁵ *The Place of St Thomas More*, p. 89

the actual organization of the king's household in twelfth century England and France,—i.e. whether Arthur is regularly provided with those officers that served as personal and administrative servants of the king. She begins accordingly with a brief historical survey of the five principal officers as they appear in actual life: steward or seneschal, who was the chief of staff, butler, second in importance, chamberlain, or king's treasurer, constable, originally master of the king's stables but later the head of the army, and chancellor, always an ecclesiastic, and not always considered a member of the household.

Beginning with Geoffrey of Monmouth, Sister Imogene examines the more important Arthurian texts down to Malory. In the conclusions which she reaches she is commendably restrained, realizing doubtless that the evidence does not furnish much solid basis for generalization. She believes that the Anglo-Norman household of Henry I "would seem to be the model on which King Arthur's household was fashioned at the outset." This is *a priori* not unlikely, but it must be said that there is little actual evidence of it in the texts. In Geoffrey only two of Arthur's followers bear official titles,—Kay and Bedivere, who are rewarded with the fiefs of Anjou and Normandy as steward and butler respectively. There is no significant development of the idea in Wace or Layamon. Wace adds picturesque detail to the enfeoffment of Kay and Bedivere, but in Layamon Sister Imogene feels that the Anglo-Saxon spirit of the king's court is more apparent. Even in the latest prose romances there is no well developed concept of the king's household with its regularly constituted officers.

At times the author finds it difficult to adhere strictly to her original purpose. The scarcity of direct testimony concerning any formal household organization leads her to devote much of her space in the chapter on the Arthurian household in the French metrical romances to an account of great feasts, their time, place, and duration. The treatment necessarily involves a good bit of repetition. The light thrown on Arthur's household is indirect and slight. The same indirectness characterizes the evidence to be drawn from the French prose romances treated in Chapter IV, and the final chapter on the Arthurian household in English verse and prose romances shows that in England the conception of a king's household is either entirely absent or but vaguely referred to.

Sister Imogene has done her work carefully and intelligently, and if her results are disappointing, she is at least to be commended for not forcing her evidence to conclusions which it will not bear.

ALBERT C. BAUGH

University of Pennsylvania

Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance. By WILLIAM G. CRANE
New York Columbia University Press, 1937. Pp x +
285 \$3 50.

The Life, Letters, and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638
By LOUISE BROWN OSBORN New Haven Yale University
Press, 1937 Pp. VIII + 321. \$2.50.

Dr. Crane, while studying the poetry of Donne, followed clues which led him to discover that school rhetoric had great influence upon the poetry of the sixteenth century. This is an important fact rather than a new one. Though in this study Dr. Crane limits himself to "the formal basis of Elizabethan prose style" (his subtitle), he is very much embarrassed with riches. He tries to tell the whole story at once, and the story is too long and complex so to be told.

Elizabethan fiction, for example, shows the results of its authors' training in school rhetoric. Dr. Crane writes a chapter sixteen pages long, "The Sentimental Novel and Romance," and another of twenty-four pages, "The Narrative Discourse," attempting to say something about the rhetorical element in every work of prose fiction from the sixteenth century, with the versified *Mirror for Magistrates* to boot. This treatment allows him three pages for the rhetoric of the *Arcadia*, a statistic which will serve as a comment on the whole study. By casting his net so widely (he tries to "cover" all prose forms except the sermon, which was, after all, as rhetorical as any), Dr. Crane bars himself from making a thorough analysis of any single work or an entirely clear demonstration of any important point. Figures of thought and of words furnished the core of the rhetoric he speaks of, and yet he never gets down to cases on the use of figures.

Dr. Crane's second chapter, "A General Examination of Wit in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," fails to draw or to maintain tenable distinctions among the many uses of the word "wit." The author rightly points out that "wit" often was used as the equivalent of rhetorical invention, but he misses many shadings, and he is confusing when he attempts to summarize the story of "wit" in the seventeenth century. Nor is it helpful to be told (p. 87) of Ascham's *Scholemaster*, "A digression on wit takes up most of the first section." Elsewhere he maintains no distinction between *sententia* as thought, meaning, sentiment, and *sententia* as a quotable grammatical sentence packed with meaning. In general he fails to see the importance of *sententia* as a figure. Flaws and omissions are inevitable in a study dealing with such a range of topics as Dr. Crane's, yet he should not have written (p. 79) "Sidney was a Cambridge man." We must say, however, that the book is on the right track, one which will lead

the student to a more intelligent reading of sixteenth-century literature. For us, as for the men who wrote it, the *gradus ad Parnassum* must begin with the grammar-school and the rhetorical exercises in varying, amplifying, and adorning a sentiment. Dr. Crane's Appendices and Bibliography will be serviceable to students undertaking the subject of Elizabethan rhetoric.

Dr. Crane failed to utilize one document made to his hand—John Hoskins's *Directions for Speech and Style*. Hoskins (or Hoskyns, as Miss Osborn prefers it) knew more about wit and rhetoric than most of us will ever know, and he was a man of the English Renaissance. Miss Osborn has done well to give in a single volume all discoverable literary remains of the facetious and studious sergeant. Her introductory biography reveals many hitherto unnoticed facts about Hoskyns, including a second marriage, and gives an especially valuable account of his work in the House of Commons. The biography and Notes represent an impressive amount of research. Thirty-one letters here published for the first time are well worth reading. One or two which reveal Hoskyns as the distracted husband of a shrewish wife, whom he yet loves, may well turn up in future anthologies. The reader will treasure also his defiant apology for his own facetiousness.

Judging Miss Osborn's texts by an examination of that of the *Directions* alone, the reviewer reports that they are not impeccable but are sound enough for every ordinary purpose. In publishing the *Directions* from *MS. Harl. 4604*, she prints in Roman hundreds of words written in Italic, and occasionally departs from the MS. in opposite fashion. The insertion of "be" in line 15 of her p. 130 seems to be a misprint rather than a misreading; "in" has been omitted from before "both" in line 13, p. 132, and "the" from before "fashion" in line 33, p. 136. These, and the occasional change of a single letter, are unimportant lapses. More regrettable is her failure (shared by this reviewer when making his edition of the *Directions*) to use the early copy of the *Directions* given in *MS. Add. 15230*. In a few respects this manuscript is better than the Harleian exemplar.

HOYT H. HUDSON

Princeton University

Das substantivverzte Adjektiv im Französischen. Von J. MALKIEL.
Berlin. Judischer Buchverlag J. Jastrow, 1938. Pp. 140.

Un élève de M. Gamillscheg traite ici un sujet intéressant avec une finesse de jugement rare, un remarquable sens des nuances et une documentation historique impeccable. Il suit l'adjectif substantivé depuis le latin, à travers l'anc. fr., la Renaissance, le siècle classique, le XVIII^e jusqu'à nos jours et montre la multi-

plicité des motifs (stylistiques, logiques, morphologiques, ces derniers les plus importants) qui convergent dans ce trait de la grammaire. P. ex. pour la substantivation des noms de couleur il montre que le remplacement de la série *a fr nerçor, blanchor, brunor, rogor, jauneté* par *le noir, le blanc, le brun, le rouge, le jaune* est dû au manque de substantifs comme *'bleuor, grisor* d'un côté, d'autre part à l'existence d'emplois concrets du neutre de l'adjectif (*le blanc* 'un espace blanc' ou 'une matière blanche'), qui se sont généralisés. Pour l'auteur la non-existence d'un type morphologique est une donnée *a priori*—je me demande si cet état morphologique ne répond pas au fait psychologique que la couleur n'est pas toujours considérée comme qualité adhérente aux corps: c'est ce qui explique d'une part que pour les couleurs unies ou bien prononcées un abstrait (*la blancheur, rougeur*) se développe plus aisément que pour les couleurs mixtes ou chatoyantes (*bleu, gris, pers*, aussi *brun*, qui est plutôt une expression de l' 'obscurité'), d'autre part que le mot *blancheur* reste aujourd'hui inattaqué (l'auteur pense que c'est parce que la *blancheur* ne connaît pas de gamme de nuances). On se refuse à reconnaître à des traits instables ou incertains le caractère de qualité. Puis, la *blancheur* est chargée de valeurs affectives et consacrée par la poésie, ¹ *noirceur* (de *noircir* = **nigriscere*) indique, au point de vue moral, bien plus un devenir (comme le moderne *assombrissement*) qu'un état. En allemand, les noms abstraits des couleurs sont à peu près inusités (*die Weisse* ou *Weissheit* (?) subsiste, *Schwarze* aussi, mais on dit *das Grün, das Rot*)—il ne s'agit pas d'une question qu'on peut trancher dans une langue seulement. Les "lacunes" d'une langue et, à plus forte raison, de plusieurs langues me semblent devoir être interprétées par la psychologie. Dans les cas de la substantivation de l'adjectif il faudrait aussi inclure le type *sa conversation*. . . *sentant son curé de province* (au lieu de *'sa curé-té*), et l'adverbe *parler haut* (= *magnum clamare*).

¹ On peut saisir sur le vif cette nuance "poétique" des noms de couleurs en -*eur* dans l'observation de M. Pichon, *Le fr mod* VI, 301, sur des formations spontanées qu'il a entendues dans la conversation une demoiselle dit *C'est noir, c'est sombre, ici ce n'est rien comme sombrété*, en comparant le local qu'elle décrit avec celui où elle est, mais une dame dira *Était-il [ce local] d'une telle sombreur?* M. Pichon trouve cette dérivation spontanée "anarchique"—mais je vois une bonne raison au choix de *sombrété*, dans une phrase comparative où le fait abstrait d'être sombre seul est commun à différents locaux, et à celui de *sombreur*, par lequel mot l'*atmosphère* sombre d'un lieu est évoquée (cp *telle affectif*). La qualité abstraite qu'indique le suffixe -*eur* (cf *le chaud* et *la chaleur*, *le froid* et *la froideur*, de là la différence entre *chaudement*—*chaleureusement*) est aussi ce qui explique l'évolution en expression figurée de *verdeur*, ce n'est qu'au sens figure ('rude comme une plante verte') que *verd* peut à proprement dire être une qualité constante, le *verd* étant une couleur plus calme, moins prononcée que le rouge.

P 39 je ne crois pas à une identité de *l'échapper belle* avec le type latin du neutre pluriel (*multum non multa*) qui aurait été réinterprété (*la = la chose*) *la* est "indigène" et français et représente *chose*—P 91 l'auteur offre souvent des parallèles russes très intéressants. La comparaison de l'anglais avec sa riche gamme de substantivations (*the rich, the French, the Frenchman, a madman, a rich one* etc avec un *prop-word* comparable au "Fullwort" *homme*) aurait aussi pu être indiquée. Quelquefois il faut se demander s'il n'y a pas tout simplement influence de l'anglais, p ex dans le *subconscient* de Freud, au lieu de **la subconscience*, celle de l'angl *the subconscious*, imitant lui-même l'all *das Unterbewusste* (le freudisme a trouvé un accueil plus prompt dans les pays anglo-saxons que dans les pays romans)—P 122 pour *intrigant* etc il fallait invoquer l'italien *-ante* que M. Migliorini a étudié dans *Vox romanica*, cf *Le frang mod* IV, 280—Parmi les substantivations il fallait aussi énumérer les types *un qui chante, un de Baumugnes*, ou la proposition relative et l'expression avec *de* équivalent à un adjectif.

Un détail piquant. comme il s'agit probablement d'une dissertation qui devait être présentée à l'université de Berlin, les références à des savants juifs vivants ont dû être retranchées (les morts Darmesteter, Bloch, Kalepky subsistent encore—pour combien de temps?) p ex un travail de Gamillscheg publié ensemble avec un mien sous un titre commun comme *Festschrift*, présentée par deux "élèves autrichiens" à Meyer-Lubke, est citée sous la forme "Genève, 1921" ce qui rend la référence invérifiable.

LEO SPITZER

Die Laute des modernen Isländischen. Von BRUNO KRESZ. Inaugural-Dissertation, Berlin. Berlin Druck von C Schulze & Co, 1937. Pp. x + 182.

When I started my study of Icelandic phonetics in 1919 the field was a *terra incognita* with several stray remarks by phoneticians and phonetically untrained grammarians, as well as a few articles, but no book on the subject. This state of things was, however, soon to be remedied. First in the field was Malone's brilliant *Phonology of Modern Icelandic*, 1923. It was followed by the late Jón Ófeigsson's thorough *Træk af moderne ísländsk Lydlære* in S. Blondal's *Íslensk-dönsk orðabók*, 1924.¹ There followed my own *Beiträge zur Phonetik der isl Sprache*, 1927, based to a considerable extent upon instrumental studies. And in 1933 came *Icelandic Phonetics* by Sveinbjörn Sveinbjörnsson (*Acta Jutlandica V Supplementum*), a work representing a lifetime of study in close adherence to Jespersen's methods, but left incomplete by the author's untimely death in 1924.

Add to this several recent articles on the subject, and it will be

¹ Since the Dictionary began to come out in 1920 with J. Ófeigsson's phonetic notation his system actually has the priority in point of time

obvious that the field was well broken when Mr Kresz decided to subject it to renewed cultivation in his dissertation. His motives, he tells us, were twofold. In the first place he wanted to familiarize his countrymen with the correct pronunciation of Modern Icelandic (most German scholars knowing only the theoretical Old Icelandic pronunciation). In the second place he wanted to lay a foundation for further researches into Old Icelandic phonetics by fixing, as well as possible, the modern pronunciation.

His methods are sound enough. He has, as he tells us himself, tested the observation of others in daily intercourse with Icelanders during a two years' sojourn in Reykjavík. The book does, indeed, sift the observations of others with a meticulous care neither attempted nor attained by any earlier published work on the subject. In my unpublished master's thesis (of 1923) I did employ the same method of quoting and discussing the opinions of earlier writers on every sound, but I weeded out a good many of them (perhaps too many) on the ground that they had nothing of interest to contribute. Kresz contributes by far the fullest bibliography on the subject, and he quotes his many writers religiously on any sound, even if he finds their remarks either insufficient or wrong in most cases. This is of course *errare in meliorem partem*, yet one cannot but feel that more critical thought should have been devoted to this selection of works, since the bibliography is not quite complete, there are lacking several elementary Icelandic grammars, among them the only textbooks written in English and German · Snæbjorn Jónsson, *A Primer of Modern Icelandic* 1927 and Eirður S. Kvaran and Otto Fingerhut, *Lehrbuch der isländischen Sprache* 1936. Uninformed as these books often are in the field of phonetics, they are certainly not worse than the work by Páll Þorkelsson, quoted and censured by Kresz on every other page. Sometimes, however more pertinent literature is either not listed in the bibliography or not utilized in the text. Thus, no notice is taken of B. K. Þórólfsson's *Um íslenskar orðmyndir á 14. og 15. öld . . .*, Reykjavík, 1925, or his articles "Nokkur orð um hinar íslensku hljóðbreytingar $e > je$ og $y, ý, ey > i, í, ei$ " *Afnfil.* XLIV (Tillaggsband), 232-243 and "Kvantitetsomvæltningen í ísländsk," *Afnfil.* XLV, 35-181. Jón Helgason's article "Om ordet 'gud' i ísländskan," *Afnfil.* XLIV (Tillaggsband), 441-451 should have been quoted by Kresz on p. 80, where he offers a similar explanation of the form. Speaking on the same page of words like *aumk(v)a* he should have quoted my article "On some points of Icelandic Dialectal Pronunciation," *APhSc.* III (1928), 264-265, which he actually lists in his bibliography. There also is listed "Icelandic Dialect Studies I . . .," *JEGPh.* XXXI (1932), 537-572, of which full use is not made in the text, no mention being made of a peculiar type of diphthongs and triphthongs there described, as far as I know, for the first time. Lacking in the bibliography are, further, my articles "Ein

tegund íslenskrar hljóðfyrirringar . . .," in *Festskrift til Finnur Jónsson* 1928, pp. 395-98 and "Some Icelandic words with *kv ~ kv*," *APhSc.*, VII (1932), 226-248. Probably too late to come to the author's notice was the extremely instructive dialect table by Aðalsteinn Sigmundsson in *Landspróf voruð 1934* (Reykjavík 1935) as well as my comments on it "Málbreytingar," in *Menntamáli* 1936, pp. 192-197.

It is only fair to acknowledge that if Kresz quotes an author, he not only quotes him right (as a rule), but his criticism is also in the great majority of cases reasonable and to the point. There are of course exceptions. Thus Malone's term "rim articulation" referring to the dentals, as *t, d, n*, is interpreted as meaning "pralveolar" (pp. 86 and 89) or "supra-dental" (p. 98). But since "rim" in Malone's terminology means "edge of teeth and gums," the tongue articulating against it is bound to touch also both back of teeth and gums, which is the very pronunciation rightly given by Kresz himself.

On the whole Kresz vindicates himself as an excellent phonetical observer: there are very few cases indeed where he undoubtedly makes a mistake, as when he thinks that *g* and *k* are invariably fronted before the ending *-endur* (*vegendur, lerkendur*). I also have my doubts about the allegedly South-Eastern form /se ja/, for the usual /sei. ja/. I believe that the latter form of this common word is used all over the country. A gen. pl. *damna* sounds fabricated to me, the verb *gamna* illustrates the phonetical point.

Other cases are of course open to dispute, for instance his system of length notation. To indicate length of final vowels is, to be sure, an improvement. But I am inclined to prefer Jón Ófeigsson's marking of half-long consonants in intervocalic groups like /hes. dør, ver. ða, eb. la, vad. la/. In the first two examples Kresz marks no length, but the two remaining he gives as /eb la, vadl: a/, showing that he does not confine his length marks to length notation only.

While Kresz is undoubtedly a good phonetician, it is difficult to find many original observations in his book. Nevertheless it has real merit as a thorough and dependable compendium of earlier writings upon the subject and is as such indispensable to students in the field. Making fresh phonetical discoveries was, after all, hardly to be expected of a new man, if the earlier studies were any good. But the unerring skill with which Kresz selects in most cases, as I believe, the right or plausible pronunciation is to me proof enough that much can be expected from him if he chooses to go on with his studies,—in Icelandic or any other tongue.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Johns Hopkins University

Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats 1820-1824. Edited with a Biographical Introduction by FRED EDGCUMBE With a Preface by MAURICE BUXTON FORMAN New York: Oxford University Press, 1937 Pp. xxviii + 77. \$3.00.

Life of John Keats. By CHARLES ARMITAGE BROWN. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by DOROTHY HYDE BODURTHA and WILLARD BISSELL POPE London [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. viii + 129. \$2.50

Some Letters & Miscellanea of Charles Brown, the Friend of John Keats & Thomas Richards. Edited by MAURICE BUXTON FORMAN. London [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. xiv + 146. \$3.00.

These three little volumes of memoirs of and letters about John Keats by his personal friends will be received gratefully by students of Keats's poetry. Records of this kind give invaluable facts about a poet's life and poems and re-create the personal, social, and intellectual environment in which he lived and by which his poems were conditioned.

The Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats, edited by Fred Edgcumbe, will solve for all time the problem of the character of the girl whom Keats loved and will afford satisfactory evidence for estimating her influence upon his life and poetry. The misrepresentation of Miss Brawne as a lamia (and indeed as the Lamia of Keats's poem) who was a blight upon Keats's life began in the gossip of the Reynolds and Dilke families, was developed by successive biographers and critics out of the morbidly jealous letters which Keats wrote in the period of his sickness and despair, and attained its climax in Mr. J. Middleton Murry's *Keats and Shakespeare*. Miss Amy Lowell examined the manuscript letters and published a just estimate of Miss Brawne's character but scholars in England doubted the authenticity of the letters and discounted their significance. Mr. Fred Edgcumbe, however, has established the authenticity of the letters and has given us an admirable edition of them.

Miss Brawne's letters have convinced me that she was more intelligent, more cultured, and more attractive than Georgiana Wylie, Jane Reynolds, or any other young lady whom Keats knew. I am impressed by the intensity of her love for Keats, by the peculiar pride which caused her to conceal this love from everyone except his young sister, and by the unusual sense of responsibility which she felt for his sister. She wrote Fanny Keats shortly after Keats went to Italy, employed diplomacy to secure permission from the Abbess to visit Fanny Keats, and became all things to the lonely girl who

had no close relatives in England. She advised Fanny Keats in social and literary matters, gave her designs for dresses, lent her books and magazines, and asked her to make comments upon the books which she read. In every way Miss Brawne was worthy of Keats's love for her.

This first edition of Charles Brown's *Life of John Keats* contains little that is new to students of Keats's poetry, for, although Brown's *Life* remained unpublished for one hundred years after it was written, it was the basis of Richard Monckton Milnes' *Life* (1848), and the most significant and striking passages in it were quoted in Colvin's biographies of Keats. Charles Brown together with Charles Cowden Clarke redeemed Keats's reputation not only from the ridicule and vituperation of the reviewers but also from the weakness of character which his friends, Shelley and Leigh Hunt, with the best of motives, had ascribed to him. Brown did not present as many intimate details of Keats's life and poetry as we may desire, but he related the vivid stories of the composition of the "Ode to a Nightingale," *Otho the Great*, *The Cap and Bells*, *Hyperion*, and *The Fall of Hyperion*.

Some Letters & Miscellanea of Charles Brown reveals Brown's personal and literary qualities and makes clear the identity and character of Thomas Richards, who has been a vague and shadowy figure in the circle of Keats's friends. Brown's letters contain shrewd comments on Byron and Shelley.

C. L. FINNEY

Vanderbilt University

Carlyle et la pensée latine. By ALAN CAREY TAYLOR. Paris: Boivin et Cie., 1937. Pp. viii + 442. 60 fr. (Études de littérature étrangère et comparée, 8.)

The present work extends the limits of Dr. Taylor's earlier study¹ so as to present Carlyle's literary fortune in the five Neo-Latin countries of Europe up to 1936. The three chronological divisions in the new work (as against one in the earlier) are marked by dates important in Carlyle's individual history as well as in his influence. 1825-64, 1865-81, 1882-1935. Under each main division the penetration of Carlyle's influence into each of the participating countries is examined.

France was much the earliest to take up Carlyle, as it has been the most sensitive to the various aspects of his thought. Nevertheless even in France his style, humor, nationalism, sectarianism,

¹ *Carlyle, sa première fortune littéraire en France (1825-1865)* Paris: Champion, 1929. This older material, with few omissions, occasional condensation, and some interesting additions, constitutes about 150 pages of the new work.

and mysticism limited his popularity. Political changes in France (1830, 1848, 1852, and 1870-71) variously affected his influence. And as long as he continued to write, his changing subject-matter of course modified the reception of his thought. Thus both accidental and essential causes conditioned his influence in France until after his death and complicated Dr. Taylor's task.

Widespread idealistic and conservative reaction near the end of the century proved favorable to Carlyle. Massive penetration of his influence was first notable in France in the 1830's, somewhat later in Italy, and then in Spain. Already knowledge of Carlyle had reached the latter two countries—in both cases first through the French. Industrial, social, political, and moral, as well as literary, developments had prepared the way for more. Within one decade (1887-96) *Heroes* was translated in all three countries. Under the same impulse, extending over into the new century, most of his other works were translated, and excellent critiques appeared in the three countries. But by the outbreak of the war, the grand impulse had run out.

Since the war, French interest has not revived. But elsewhere, in the atmospheres that have produced authoritarian regimes, harmonious elements in Carlyle's thought have flourished. In Italy especially, at least before the recent Anglophobia developed, he was hailed as a preparator of Fascism.

Thus the penetration of Carlyle's thought into the Neo-Latin countries is charted. The main impulses under which it has taken place are well distinguished. And the chief literary organs and persons involved are to a large extent isolated. Dr. Taylor's control of the broad relations is matched and informed by his care over the smaller problems. His identification of anonymous authors (e g., p. 28: Chasles), his discovery and use of evidence that had hitherto been passed over (pp. 60-65. Michelet), his tracing of the personal motivations of translators and critics (p. 181: Barot), his detailed study of influences (pp. 280-94 Carducci's *Ca va*), and his additions to the knowledge of Carlyleana (pp. 389-427, "Bibliographie". hundreds of items connected with Carlyle but not found in Dyer²) are a few evidences of his scholarly care. And throughout, his judgment is temperate.

Admirable in its achievement, the book nevertheless leaves some themes unfinished. For example, Carlyle's influence on major literary figures in France, Spain, and Italy is usually only sketched. And the ready acceptance of Carlyle by French socialists is not adequately accounted for.

HILL SHINE

Maryville College

² Froude's article of 1881, thought by Dr. Taylor (p. 242, note 3) to be lacking in Dyer's *Bibliography*, is present though improperly entered (see Dyer, p. 520)

Essays Historical and Literary. By SIR CHARLES FIRTH Oxford
Clarendon Press [New York Oxford University Press], 1938.
Pp viii + 247. \$5.00.

There seems today to be a gulf fixed between the historian and the man of letters, and it is seldom that the qualities of both are found united in one man. Indeed those trained in either discipline tend to view with suspicion the appearance, within their own sphere, of interests supposed to belong to the other. To realise how comparatively recently this state of affairs has arisen we need only remember that Bacon could define poetry quite naturally as "feigned history," while Sidney, Raleigh, Milton and Burnet held views about the function of history which closely resembled their own or their contemporaries' theories on the function of poetry. Both history and poetry were to "teach by examples of times past" (in Raleigh's words) "such wisdom as may guide our desires and actions." And it was not only as poet, but as historian too, that Milton hoped to justify the ways of God to men. As Firth says, Milton "used British history for the purpose of edification, just as he would have used his British epic"—and as he did in fact use his higher argument.

However, since the "kinds" have, for better or for worse, become separate, we can assign these reprinted essays of Sir Charles Firth's to "history" rather than to "literature." They contain little literary criticism in the strict sense, but they contain much that the student of literature should know or want to know—as, what Ballads and broadsides were current in Shakespeare's England, how far Milton's "scientific incredulity" (so strikingly shown in his attitude to legendary history) influenced his abandonment of the projected *Arthuriad*, what Bunyan owed to the popular romances (an important reminder, in spite of Owst's recent demonstration of Bunyan's main indebtedness to the sermon-tradition), or how the political allusions in *Gulliver* are related to Swift's successive preoccupations with English and Irish affairs. The essay on Bunyan is perhaps the most satisfying to the "literary" reader, for here Firth shows real appreciation of the qualities of mind and style which produced "the prose epic of English Puritanism." But Firth is really at his best when he is writing as a historian about historians—comparing Burnet with Clarendon, or marking the difference between the modern conception of history as determined by general causes and the 17th century view of it as the biography of a few particular great men, or as the story of "the strange windings and turnings of Providence"

BASIL WILLEY

Pembroke College, Cambridge

BRIEF MENTION

Dizionario di Marina medievale e moderno Reale Accademia d'Italia xv Rome 1937. Pp xxxiii + 1367. Ce volume important est le premier d'une série de dictionnaires des arts et des métiers que l'Académie italienne patronise. Il a été présenté par le président de l'Académie, Marconi, préfacé et dirigé par l'illustre romanisant de Rome G. Bertonì et exécuté par MM Enrico Falqui et Angelo Prati, lequel s'est chargé, avec le jugement sain et le doigté délicat qu'on lui connaît, de la si délicate partie étymologique. L'Italie a ainsi son Jal, mais un Jal "à la page," les plus récentes modernisations techniques de la marine italienne étant incluses et les étymologies étant mises au pas des plus récents dictionnaires au point de les corriger quelquefois cf. *bonaccia*, *carena*, *cavo*, *gondola*. L'exécution de cette œuvre, à cheval sur la technique, l'histoire et l'histoire des mots, a duré cinq ans et a pu ainsi profiter des recherches étymologiques de Vidos et Maccarrone. Nous ne pouvons que féliciter tous les collaborateurs de cette réussite. Chaque article comporte une définition soigneuse et exhaustive ainsi que l'historique du mot, avec l'énumération des premiers textes, des formes dialectales italiennes et parallèles d'autres langues et avec une bibliographie complète (où peut-être les auteurs pourraient être nommés d'une façon plus conséquente) les *Sachen* à côté des *Wörter* apparaissent sur des planches parsemant copieusement le texte.

Voici quelques remarques *bastingue* la dernière et plus convaincante étymologie, celle de M Bruch, du fr *bast(r)ingue* = germ *web-strung*, manque — *burchio* mon explication *Arch rom*, vii, 512 = **buricare* man que — *gomena* cf J Coromines, "Homenatge a Rubió y Lluch," iii, 13 = [σχοινιον] ἡγούμενον — *lazzaretto* ne me semble pas explicable par le suffixe *-eto* = *-etum* et je maintiens l'étymologie *Nazaret* — *maccheria* 'calma di mare senza moto, quando il cielo è nuvoloso' sera le grec *μακαρία* 'le pays des bienheureux' conçu comme une illusion (de là la glose esp. 'engaño' dont j'ai traité ici 1938, p 136) c'est le calme de la mer pouvant faire illusion — *ormeggiare* il faudrait citer mon article "Katal Étymologien" *Mittel Semw Hamburg*, 1918, p 31 et Coromines, l. c, p 21 — *pilota* l'étymologie, du radical de *pes* 'pied,' ne me semble pas expliquer le suffixe *-ota* — Peut-être aimerait-on avoir la prononciation italienne de mots étrangers (comme *yacht*) et aussi la traduction des termes de marine dans les principales langues européennes

LEO SPITZER

The Jefferson Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Reader. By EDWIN BOINEST SETZLER, EDWIN LAKE SETZLER and HUBERT HOLLAND SETZLER. New York. The Macmillan Company, 1938. xiv + 198 pp. This book, which owes its inspiration to Jefferson's *An Essay on the Anglo-Saxon*, is an attempt to provide a simple

grammar of the kind suggested in this essay, one whose chief end is to show the complete dependence of Modern English upon Old English. The grammar proper is followed by about sixty pages of selections in prose and verse together with a brief section on versification. The attempt seems to me not to have resulted happily. More than a fourth of the section devoted to grammar is spent in largely futile diagrams intended to show how the written forms of Modern English inflections are derived from those of Old English or in equally futile groupings in parallel columns intended to show correspondences between the Old English and the Modern English uses of cases, etc. The classification of cases as nominative, possessive, dative, objective, and ablative does violence to both the earlier and the present stage of the language, and the grouping of all nouns except the *-as* plural masculines, the *-n* stems, and the consonant stems with umlauted plural into a single "miscellaneous declension" is a distortion of Old English grammar. More serious faults than this arbitrariness of nomenclature and classification are the errors and misstatements occurring throughout the work. A number are grouped in the account of the Alphabet and Sounds (pp. 9-11). More serious are the misstatements and false implications about weak verbs of Class I (pp. 54-56), and about *i*-umlaut in verbs of Class II (p. 57). Probably the most remarkable is the assertion in a footnote on page 53 that the dual form of the personal pronouns "probably came into Old English from the Greek as its chief occurrences are in the Old English translations from the Greek." After this statement one need not be greatly surprised to find the *Beowulf* characterized as a "national Anglo-Saxon epic" or to see its date of composition placed as early as the sixth or seventh century (p. 139). It is difficult to see how this work was approved by a competent reader for the publishers.

W. F. BRYAN

Northwestern University

Helicon. The International Commission for Modern Literary History has begun the publication of a review called *Helicon* devoted especially to the study of topics that concern most European literatures, such as Romanticism, Realism, genres, historiography, etc. Three numbers are to appear each year. The editor is Professor Jean Hankiss, of Debrecen. The editorial committee is headed by MM. Baldensperger, Farinelli, Petersen, and Van Tieghem. The first number (188 pp.) contains articles by several of these scholars. Subscriptions—Fr. 180 or RM. 15—should be addressed to Editions Pantheon, Amsterdam or Leipzig. The review will doubtless receive the cordial support of all who are interested in literary history.

H. C. L.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIV

MARCH, 1939

Number 3

VINLAND AND ULTIMA THULE

Longinquis mortuusque

Vinland studies that are concerned with details can make but little use of sources which do not afford any. We have already had occasion, however, to point out that there are other problems besides the details of the Vinland journeys and that in order to solve these a different kind of evidence is required.¹ The main sources of the Vinland voyages, the two well-known "Vinland sagas," have the advantage of giving many details (this advantage, to be sure, is a disadvantage too, as these details can be interpreted in very different ways), but it must not be forgotten that the time when they were written down is separated from the events they relate by more than two centuries and a half, i. e. by eight or ten generations. Other sources, not so precise and not so rich in details, but nearer to the events themselves, could prove very precious in verifying and corroborating the evidence gained from analysing the sagas.

Fortunately we *have* an early source of Vinland tradition—not contemporary, indeed, but still belonging to the same century as the voyages and separated from them only by one generation. The source is a mention made by Adam of Bremen, in the part called "Descriptio Insularum Aquilonis" of his work *Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum*.² As this passage, though often spoken of, is but rarely analysed, we had better examine it more closely. It runs as follows

Praeterea unam adhuc insulam recitavit a multis in eo repertam oceano, quae dicitur Vinland, eo quid ibi vites sponte nascentur, vinum optimum ferentes. Nam et fruges ibi non seminatas habundare, non fabulosa opinione,

¹ "New Ways to Vinland Problems" *Acta Ethnologica* 1938, 17 ff.

² Ed. by Pertz, *Mon. Germ. Hist. SS* 7, Hannoverae 1846, 267 ff.

sed certa comperimus relatione Danorum Post quam insulam, ait, terra non invenitur habitabilis in illo oceano, sed omnia quae ultra sunt glacie intolerabili ac caligine immensa plena sunt Cujus rei Martianus ita meminit Ultra Thilen, inquit, navigatione unius diei mare concretum est Temptavit hoc nuper experientissimus Nordmannorum princeps Haraldus Qui latitudinem septentrionalis oceani perscrutatus navibus, tantem caligantibus ante ora deficientis mundi finibus, inmane abyssi baratrum retroactis vestigis vix salvus evasit

This passage was written between the years 1072 and 1076 or not much later, as the work is dedicated to Bishop Liemar, who was consecrated in 1072, and as it speaks of King Svein of Denmark, who died in 1076, as being still alive. Philipp Wilhelm Kohlmann,³ who calls our attention to these facts, thinks that only the first two books can be dated in this way. But Adam in the Epilogue speaks of the whole writing as a work of his youth, so that our passage, which is chapter 38 of book IV (chapter 247 of the whole work), also cannot be much later than the first two books. The person whom the author cites as his source of information is King Svein.

The variants presented in the different manuscripts are not very important. In the first sentence, MS 1, a Vienna codex of the 13th century, reads *regionem* instead of *insulam*; MS 2a (written in the 16th or 17th century, No 1175 of the Copenhagen Royal Library) explains the word *Winlund* by adding *id est terra vini*. Somewhat more remarkable is that MS 1 omits the whole second part of the passage, beginning with *Post quam insulam, ait. . .* On the other hand, the 16th century Hamburg MS 7 adds the following sentences *Istud etiam dixit quidam nobilis Carthusiensis praesentium scriptura et est verum. Sed iste locus in eorum idiomate Gimmendegop. Miles vero capitaneus regis dicebatur Olyden Helgeson, nauta vero Gunnar Caswen*—This same late manuscript omits in the first sentence the words *a multis*.

There are two points in this brief account that seem to be in contradiction with our later and more copious sources in the Vinland sagas. The first is the statement that the island was discovered "by many", the second is the emphasis on the proximity of ice and darkness, in spite of a contradictory detail: the whirlpool discovered by the expedition of Harald and identified in the

³ "Adam von Bremen," *Leipziger Historische Abhandlungen* 10, Leipzig 1908, 1 ff.

later manuscript with the Eddic *Gunnungagap* is far from being *concretum*. As to the first point, the Vinland sagas know but two or five voyages. As to the second, the fertility of the country, reflected in its name and described by the sagas, does not agree with neighbourhood to an arctic climate. The first contradiction, however, though it has often been used to make the whole of Adam's description dubious,⁴ is imaginary. Of course, the number of voyages, if we believe our sagas (and we have no reason not to do so), was but two according to the one saga and five according to the other. Sagas group their events around the persons of their protagonists and efface the personalities of the background, so that after reading the saga texts we really have the impression that only two or three persons, Leif, Thorfinn Karlsefni and perhaps Bjarni Herjólfsson are the discoverers of Vinland. That means that from this point of view Vinland was indeed not discovered *a multis*. But it is not to be forgotten that the sagas *do* speak of the crew that followed these leaders, that besides giving the names of some of their mates they give the exact number of members of each expedition. Chapter 8 of the *Eiríks saga rauða*⁵ states that the crew of Thorfinn consisted of *fjórir tigur manna ok hundrað*—this number probably means 140 and not 160 (ON *hundrað* can signify 100 as well as 120), to prove this statement would lead us too far afield and it is of absolutely no importance for our present purposes. According to chapter 3 of the *Grænlandingsaþáttur*,⁶ Leif's crew consisted of 35 men, that of Thorvald of 30 (chapter 5), that of Thorfinn Karlsefni of 60 men and five women (chapter 7). Chapter 8 relates that Freydis made an agreement with the brothers Helgi and Finnbogi that their respective crews consist of 30 men each, but that she fraudulently took five more with her. We will not insist on the question of which saga we are to believe, as we at any rate may be sure that there were more than one hundred, if not several hundreds, who reached and saw the coasts of the New Continent. And each of these men, whether mentioned by name in the sagas or not, considered himself legitimately as a discoverer

⁴ Fridtjof Nansen, *In Northern Mists*, 1, London 1911, 382

⁵ Ed. by Einar Ól. Sveinsson and Matthías Thórdarson, *Eyrbyggja Saga* Íslenzk Fornrit iv, Reykjavík 1935, 193 ff

⁶ Ed. under the title of *Grænlandinga Saga* by Sveinsson and Thórdarson, *op cit*, 239 ff

of the new country, the descendants of each one were legitimately proud of their far-traveled forefathers. King Svein and his authorities had had the opportunity to know of many people, by hearsay at least, who were reckoned discoverers, or descendants of discoverers, of Vinland. They could not help having the impression that Vinland really had been discovered *a multis*, and when Adam repeats this statement, he is by no means in contradiction with the sagas.

The second point, the situation of Vinland near the arctic region, is worth examining more closely, as it throws light upon Adam's idea of the country he is describing. Adam himself makes our task easy with a sentence that seems to have escaped his pen, a sentence which overthrows the coherence of his narrative but which for that very reason is instructive, showing the *attitude* of the writer towards his subject. He says that beyond Vinland there is but ice and fog, and he adds *Cujus rei Martianus ita meminit Ultra Thulen, inquit, navigatione unus diei mare concretum est*. The passage of Martianus Capella⁷ that Adam is referring to runs in reality thus

Sed ultima omnium [insularum] Thyle, in qua solstitiali tempore continuus dies, brumalique nox perennis exigitur. Ultra quam navigatione unus diei mare concretum est.

This is a commonplace of ancient and mediaeval geographical literature, but it is curious that Adam quotes it here, when speaking about Vinland, and not where it would be in place, in his chapter on Thule. To find out the reason why he does this, we should see what Adam says about Thule itself. He discusses Thule in chapter 244 (or IV 35), where he says

Insula Thyle, quae per infinitum a ceteris secreta, longe in medio sita est oceano, vix, inquit, nota habetur. De qua tam a romanis scriptoribus, quam a barbaris multa referuntur digna praedicari. Ultima, inquit, omnium Thyle, in qua aestivo solsticio, sole cancri signum transeunte, nox nulla, brumalis solsticio perinde nullus dies. Hoc quidam senis mensibus fieri arbitrantur. Item Beda scribit, in Britannia aestate lucidas noctes haut dubie reponere, ut in solsticio continui dies habetur senis mensibus, noctesque e diverso ad brumam sole remoto. Quod fieri in insula Thyle Pytheas Massiliensis scribit sex dierum navigatione a Britannia distante. Haec itaque Thyle nunc Island appellatur, a glacie quae ocea-

⁷ *De nuptiis philologiae et Mercurii* VI. 666.

num adstringit De qua etiam hoc memorabile ferunt, quod eadem glacies ita nigra et arida videatur propter antiquitatem, ut incensa ardeat Est autem insula permaxima, ita ut populos infra se multos contineat, qui solo pecorum fetu vivunt eorumque vellere teguntur nullae ibi fruges, minima lignorum copia, propterea in subterraneis habitant speluncis, communi tecto et strato gaudentes cum pecoribus suis Haec de Islandis et de ultima Thyle veraciter comperi, fabulosa praeteriens

The first part of this narrative, with the exception of one sentence, is compiled from earlier authors The passage *Insula Thyle . . . nota habetur* is borrowed from Orosius,⁸ *Ultima inquirunt . . . fieri arbitrantur* is taken from Beda,⁹ who himself borrowed the first part of his sentence, up to the words . . . *nullus dies*, from Solinus¹⁰ Finally—and here Adam himself gives his source—another passage of the same chapter of Beda is used The second part of the narrative is a fairly exact picture of Iceland as known in the rest of Europe in the 11th century, the legend of the burning ice, too, could not be felt as very unlike reality The identification of Iceland with the Thule of the Greek and Roman authors is due to Dicuil,¹¹ who made the equation as early as in 825,¹² before the colonizing of Iceland by the Norse, while it was still only the abode of some Irish hermits This identification became common during the Middle Ages (only a few authors, as Giraldus Cambrensis,¹³ make a distinction between Yslandia and Tyle), so that Adam's description of Iceland does not contain anything which would be peculiar to him Only one sentence, intercalated between the quotations from Orosius and Beda has a special interest for us Here he says *De qua tam a romanis scriptoribus, quam a barbaris multa referentur digna praedicari* This sentence is the more remarkable as it is in open contradiction with the preceding one (this borrowed from Orosius), where we are told that on Thule *vix nota habetur* On the other hand, this passage is in curious agreement with one of Pomponius Mela (it is rather improbable that Adam had read it¹⁴). *Thyle Belcarum littora adposita est*,

⁸ I 2 28

⁹ *De temporum ratione* 31

¹⁰ *Polyhist* 22 Ed by Mommsen, Berlin 1895

¹¹ *Liber de mensura orbis terrae* VII 2 2 ff

¹² See chapter IX 5 of his work

¹³ *Topographia Hibernica* II 13, 14, 17

¹⁴ Kohlmann's enumeration (*op cit* 57) of the influences Adam possibly underwent does not show any trace of Adam's knowing Pomponius Mela.

Graus et nostri celebrata carminibus. . .¹⁵ It is obvious that Pomponius is exaggerating, Greek poetry did not deal much with Thule, though we know that at least one Greek novel was written about it, the book of Antonius Diogenes on the *Twenty-Four Myacles Beyond Thule* Τὼν ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἀπιστῶν λόγοι κδ',¹⁶ but it is characteristic that the "proverbial use"¹⁷ of the name *Ultima Thule* aroused such a kind of *paramnesia*. Indeed, the word Thule with its constant epithet *ultima* was always felt as something emphatic, something provided with some significance apt to create the atmosphere of the feeling of mystery and deeper reality, of myth or of poetry. This it was that forced Adam, even at the risk of contradiction with his preceding statement, to evoke Thule as an object of literature, even of non-Latin literature—an allusion which is rather rare in his times. He cannot help doing so, as even the sober Giraldus, when speaking on Tyle, cannot help quoting, quite without connection with the rest of his relation *Vngilius Augusto, "Tibi serviat ultima Tyle"*¹⁸

We do not know whether there really existed passages of *barbares scriptores* known by Adam and dealing with Thule, or Iceland (Adam shows no trace of acquaintance, direct or indirect, with Norse poetry), probably not. Adam probably was the victim of the same exaggeration of memory which we find before him with Pomponius, and he had still more reason for it, as in the Middle Ages fancy took still stronger hold of the deeply significant notion of *Ultima Thule*. The work of mediaeval fancy attributed such traits to the geographical notion of Thule (itself inherited from antiquity) as to bring this notion closer to Vinland as Adam knew it. Therefore an examination of the mediaeval Thule notion will help us not only to understand why Adam interpolated a quotation on Thule into his description of Vinland, but also how he conceived the remote regions he is dealing with. And this can help us perhaps to take a look even behind Adam, on the nature of the tradition he heard and reported.

The deep significance of the word *Ultima Thule*, felt already by ancient authors (remember the solemn use in the well-known

¹⁵ *Chorogr.* III 6

¹⁶ Rohde, *Der griechische Roman* 250

¹⁷ G. Macdonald in Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. "Thule"

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, II, 17. No doubt he follows the Geog. of Ravenna v 33 and with him Jordanes I

prophecy of Seneca's Medea¹⁹) was felt by the Middle Ages too, Adam and Giraldus are our witnesses. And as mediaeval geography had Solinus as its chief classical source, it is he who in the greatest measure is responsible for the later evolution of the notion *Ultima Thule*. Its later fate is closely connected with him, in two ways. In the Middle Ages he was both interpolated and misunderstood. Let us see how. As an example we might take a historiographer of the 15th century, who, at the very end of the Middle Ages, tries, it would seem, to sum up the conceptions of this period. It is Hartmann Schedel²⁰ whom we quote.

Thanatos insula oceani freto Gallico a Britannia est vario termino separata Tiloe ultima insula oceani Tilos Indie insula est secundum Solinum Hec fert palmas, oleum et vineas Hec omnes terras hoc solo miraculo vincit quod quecumque arbor in ea est nunquam caret folio Ibi mons Caucasus Orchades insule

Schedel speaks of a marvelously fertile island Tiloe or Tilos, the *last* in the ocean, situated in India, near the Caucasus (the two determinations are rather contradictory but show that the island was thought of at any rate as belonging to Asia)—but its description is placed between that of the "island" Thanatos (the peninsula of Thanet) and that of the Orcades, and it is given the epithet *ultima* which is the constant and proper attribute of the Atlantic Thule. This shows that the notion of the fertile island was in some way connected with the North Atlantic. This connection with the North Atlantic could have been made easy by the name of Thule or Thyle; the description itself, on the other hand, is borrowed from Solinus,²¹ who writes in almost the same words that Schedel uses:

Tylos Indiae insula est, ea fert palmas, oleam creat, vinis abundat Terras omnes hoc miraculo sola vincit, quod quaecumque in ea arbor nascitur, nunquam caret folio Ibi mons Caucasus

Mediaeval literature as a whole got its knowledge of Thule chiefly from Solinus.²²

Multae et aliae circa Britanniam insulae, e quibus Thyle ultima, in qua aestivo solstitio sole de cancri sidere faciente transitum nox nulla bru-

¹⁹ II 379

²⁰ *Chronicorum liber*, Nuremberg 1493, fol XIX

²¹ *Polyhist* 52

²² *Polyhist.* 22.

malī solstitio peinde nullus dies Ultra Thylen accipimus pigrum et
concretum mare

So it could not help confusing the two almost homonymous islands, as Hartmann Schedel did still. Of course, the mere resemblance of names is not enough to make us understand how a tropical and an arctic island could be confused, the tropical nature of the one and the arctic nature of the other being explicitly stated by Solinus. Notwithstanding, Giraldus Cambrensis is the only one who protests against this confusion, and sums up *Sed aequivocatio non te decipiat . . . Illa enim Tylys, haec Tyle vocatur*²³. There must have been a reason why other writers could not understand what was seen so clearly by Giraldus. To be sure, there was a misunderstanding, but there must have been reasons for this. It is clearly stated that Thule is an arctic island, and when we look for the facts that made it possible to confuse with this arctic island an extremely fertile one, we find if not the cause of the confusion, at least a very significant symptom of the proceeding in the mediaeval manuscripts of the work of Solinus itself. Most of the mediaeval manuscripts have interpolated, between the words *nullus dies . .* and *. . . Ultra Thylen* of the quoted passage of chapter 22, the following sentences

A Caldoniae promunturio Tylen petentibus bidui navigatio est. Ab Orchardibus Tylen usque quinque dierum ac noctium navigatio est. Sed Tyle larga et diutina Pomona copiosa est. Qui illic habitant principio veris inter pecudes pabulis vivunt, dein lacte, in hiemem conpercut arborum fructus. Utuntur feminis vulgo certum matrimonium nulli.²⁴

The interpolation was probably made in Ireland, at the end of the 6th century.²⁵ In it we have not only a clear statement that the island of Thule was reckoned fertile and arctic at the same time, but we see this belief in some way consecrated and corroborated for eternity by its being attributed to the great authority of Solinus. This is more than a mere confusion of names: this

²³ *Op. cit.* II 17. The confusion is found as early as the *Imago Mundi* of Honorius of Autun I 31, where we are told that Thule is the farthest island in the North, an island where the trees are ever green and where there is perpetual day in summer, perpetual night in winter.

²⁴ Mommsen, *O Iulii Solini collectanea*, Berolini 1895, 219.

²⁵ Mommsen, *op. cit.* p. lxxxix ff., Heinrich Zimmer, "Über die frühesten Beziehungen der Iren mit den Nordgermanen," *SB Berlin* 1891/1, 286.

shows that there was no doubt of the possibility of such a phenomenon.

To be sure, there exists an attempt at a different interpretation of this passage of pseudo-Solinus Zimmer,²⁶ who thinks that the ancient and early-mediaeval Thule is identical with the Shetlands, gives a quite rational explanation of the passage the islanders live during the summer on animal products, during the winter on fruits. It is, however, difficult to understand why this people should have adopted a way of life quite contrary to every other pastoral civilization. It is also difficult not to translate the passage as referring to ever-fruitleaf apple-trees (and perhaps—the first interpretation allowing it—also to fruits gathered in the winter). It would be difficult, too, to understand why other works of mediaeval literature insist on the paradisiac character of the island, if rationalist explanations would be satisfactory in this area.

We might quote, besides, a poem of the 13th century,²⁷ It depends evidently on Solinus (chapter 52) but it calls the island Thile. The confusion in the works of other writers consists in putting the Indian island Tylos together with the description of the northern Thule, but they always give it its correct name as read in Solinus (it is to be noted, too, that the name of the Atlantic island is spelt sometimes without an *h*, but that of the Indian island never with one) When now the exaggerated description of this happy island is headed by the name Thile, then there is more than a mere confusion of names When there is a confusion, there is a confusion of the very notions, a fact that is likely to show that already the interpolator of Solinus could look upon his Thule as an island of wonder Here is a part of the poem

De insula Thile

Non habet exile mundi decus insula Thile,
Haec qui lignorum nescit casum foliorum,
Non illi fronde nemus nudatur, oliva volumus,
Ficus, acer, cornus, pirus, alnus, amigdalus, ornus,
Nux, arbor quaevis foliis viret omnibus aëvis

Mysterium ²⁸

Ut nobis visum, locus hic signat paradisum

²⁶ *Op cit* 287, 294

²⁷ MS Arundel No 201 in British Museum, fol 44 vo ; printed by Thomas Wright, *St Patrick's Purgatory*, London 1844, 94 n.

²⁸ I. e. moralization.

This is to say that the happy character of the island is overstated in such a manner that it may be called, if but in an allegorical way, an epiphany of Paradise. This ought not to astonish us. In mediaeval literature we have also other traces of descriptions of happy islands, inspired by ancient authors but saturated with mediaeval concepts of non-Roman origin. Isidorus Hispalensis in his description of the Canaries, which he too, like the ancient authors, calls *Fortunatae Insulae*, is compelled to add: *Unde gentium error, et saecularum carmina poetarum, propter soli foecunditatem, easdem esse paradisum putaverunt*²⁹ So it is quite natural that other mediaeval poets, like Geoffrey of Monmouth, use the description of Isidore in compiling a story of another happy island, Avallon, unknown to antiquity and derived from Celtic myths.³⁰ In *Vita Merlini*³¹ Telgesinus gives a long cosmographical account. Perhaps it is not mere chance that Avallon is spoken of just after the mention of Tylos, though it hardly could be imagined in the proximity of India. The respective lines (906 ff.) of the poem run thus.

At Tylos aeterno producit vere virentes
Flores et frondes per tempora cuncta virendo
Insula Pomorum, quae Fortunata vocatur,
Ex re nomen habet, quia per se singula profert
Non opus est illi sulcantibus arva colonis
Omnis abest cultus, nisi quem natura ministrat
Ultro fecundas segetes producit et uvas
Nataque poma suis praetense germine silvis
Omnia gignit humus vice graminis ultro redundans
Annis centenis aut ultra vivitur illic³²

These two mediaeval poems, the anonymous one of the Arundel MS and the *Vita Merlini* of Geoffrey, give us a clue to the better understanding of the Irish interpolation of Solinus, which itself is a precious witness of the mediaeval concept of Thule. They show us that if the confusion of the names Tylos and Thyle is to be in

²⁹ *Etym.* xiv 6 8.

³⁰ Edmond Faral, *La légende Arthurienne* 1/2, Paris 1929, 299 ff. believes that the name of Avallon was created by Geoffrey, but he admits that it was created in order to design the well-known concept of a Celtic happy island.

³¹ Ed. by Faral, *op. cit.* 1/3 305 ff.

³² On the ancient and mediaeval sources of this passage cf. Faral, *op. cit.* 1/2. 302 ff.

any way held responsible for the development of the idea of a fertile Thule, this was only possible because the Middle Ages were inclined to localize happily fertile islands not only in tropical India, but also in the seas of Europe. The anonymous poem is interesting because of the explicit identification of the happy island with Paradise. Geoffrey, on the other hand, gives us a valuable parallel to pseudo-Solinus by giving the name of *Avallon* or *Insula Pomorum* 'Apple Island'³³ to his island *quae Fortunata vocatur*. This is nothing extraordinary, if we think of the rôle of the apple in Irish myths on the Happy Islands as e. g. in *Echtra Condla*,³⁴ and it is for that very reason that the words *diutina Pomona copiosa* of the Irish interpolator of Solinus are very significant. It will be seen that this mediaeval description of the ancient Thule is penetrated by the belief in the Happy Islands. Perhaps even the statement *utuntur feminis vulgo* is a reminiscence of the great sensual pleasures that the Celtic Happy Islands afford their inhabitants. (We are used to calling the belief in the Happy Islands a Celtic one, as Celtic religious texts give us its most genuine examples, but it is a belief which must be called a common European one in the Middle Ages if we consider how the whole mediaeval literature of Europe is full of its traces.)

If we would cling to the rationalist explanation which attributes the transfer of the Happy Islands to the remotest land in the North to a mere mistaking of Thule for Tylos, we must further suppose that an ancient author made this transfer. The geographical knowledge of the Greeks and Romans concerning the North was rudimentary enough (in early times at least) to permit the myth of the happy country of the Hyperboreans³⁵. But the ancient did nothing of the kind. For them, the word *Ultima Thule*, with its emphatic epithet, was charged with deep significance and mystery—this atmosphere is reflected still in our mediaeval authors, and no doubt, played its part in opening the way

³³ The meaning of the word *Avallon* is, in spite of other theories, indeed this, cf. Ernst Windisch, "Das keltische Britannien bis auf Kaiser Arthur," *Abh. d. phil.-hist. Kl. d. kgl. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss.* 29, 1912, 114; Louis Cons, "Avallo," *Mod. Philology* 28, 1930/31, 385 ff., C. H. Slover, "Avalon," *ibid.* 395 ff.

³⁴ *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 17, 195 ff. The parallel was already remarked by Windisch *l. cit.* For more parallels see Cons, *op. cit.*, 393 f.

³⁵ Cf. Daebitz, Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. "Hyperboreer."

to the evolution of the Thule idea. Yet Thule as a happy island appears only in the Middle Ages, in writers who, themselves living in a cold climate, could have known perfectly well that the climate of the far north was even more severe than their own. It is not upon a mere conjecture that we base this statement: Beda in a passage cited by Adam (see above) deduces the division of day and night in Thule quite logically from the circumstances in Britain. So that if mediaeval authors nevertheless confirmed the fertile character of Thule, or were at least inclined to confuse it with other fertile, or happy, islands, this must have a special reason. And this reason cannot be other than the transfer of the myths of the distant Happy islands of the Dead to the distant, *ultima*, Thule. The deep reality of *distance*, the religious aspect of the *last* of the islands as the *last* station of human existence is responsible for this transfer.

It was necessary for us to bring out all this in order to see clearly Adam of Bremen's attitude with regard to his Vinland. Vinland *per definitionem* was a fertile island, it was also the remotest one Adam knew of. The remotest island, the remote island *par excellence* of the imagination of his times, *Ultima Thule*, could without difficulty be described as being marvelously fertile in spite of the nearness of eternal ice and fog. So it was quite natural that the sentence *Ultra Thulen*—i. e. beyond the *last* island—*navigatrione unus dies mare concretum est* was intercalated by Adam into the description of the island which was for him both remote and fertile: into the description of Vinland. This means that, in the line of tradition which Adam represents, Vinland took the place of *Ultima Thule*, of the remote, fertile and ice-surrounded island. It could not have taken this place, had it not been adapted to fill it.

That the line of tradition reported by Adam is not an entirely independent one, but that it represents the whole of the Vinland tradition, we have already seen in one point of slight importance: we have seen that Adam's mention of the discovery of the country "by many" is not contradictory to the account given in our main sources for the Vinland tradition. We are also able to show that in other points too there are coincidences between Adam and the rest of the tradition, so that we can speak of one single Vinland tradition. (To be sure, the divergencies of the two sagas demonstrate that this single tradition was later on split up into several lines; but now we are speaking only of the general characteristics.)

Precisely the nearness of Vinland to the icy and uninhabited regions has its parallel in another of our early pieces of evidence on Vinland, in the runic inscription of Hønen

This inscription,³⁶ which is unfortunately lost, only copies remaining, dates from the years about 1010-1050.³⁷ If the reading proposed by Bugge is right—as only imperfect copies are preserved, there may be doubts³⁸—the inscription tells how some voyagers underwent great misery in the icy deserts (*óbyggð*) near Vinland. We risk a *cuculus vitiosus* if we try to corroborate the authenticity of this inscription by its agreement with Adam's view and at the same time use the parallelism of Adam with the inscription as a proof of the close adherence of this author to the common Vinland tradition—but perhaps it is true in this case, as in many others, that two halves reinforce each other and make a whole piece of argument. We may the more cheerfully take this risk, as we have also in one Vinland saga a sentence which is likely to strengthen our argument. The *Enikssaga rauða*³⁹ characterizes one of the chief companions of Thorfinn Karlsefni, Thorhall the Hunter. First his bad qualities are enumerated: he is black, demon-like, taciturn and evil-tongued, and a bad Christian. And after this, as a contrast, as if to show his value in the expedition, it is told that he had a deep knowledge of the *óbyggðir*. This could have hardly been an advantageous quality with an expedition into a sunny country where wheat and vine grow without being cultivated, had it not been supposed that the *óbyggðir*—this word designates the icy deserts in the neighbourhood of the Greenland settlements—in some way belonged to the geographical complex of Vinland.

If Adam transferred the characteristics of *Ultima Thule* to Vinland, he ended with the same concept as that represented in the Vinland tradition. This is a proof of what we have said above that the tradition about Vinland was well suited to be drawn into the cycle of tradition represented by the classical and mediaeval literature on Thule. In other words: Vinland was looked upon as

³⁶ Sophus Bugge, *Noies indskrifter med de yngren runer, Hønen-runerne fra Ringenike*, Kristiania 1902.

³⁷ Bugge, *op cit* 19.

³⁸ Cf e g G M Gathorne-Hardy, *The Norse Discoverers of America*, Oxford 1921, 286 n, or the review by Hugo Gering, *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 38, 1906, 140 f.

³⁹ Chapter 8.

a strange and mystical island which, just as well as Thule, could properly bear the significant epithet *ultima*, and this as early as in the century of its discovery. So we are told by the evidence of Adam of Bremen and—if Bugge's reading and dating are correct—by the still earlier evidence of the Honen stone. We have elsewhere risked the hypothesis⁴⁰ that Vinland already was so considered by the very men who set out in search of it. We have risked even the statement that the notion of Vinland itself (not of the other geographical names mentioned in the sagas) was primitively considered as one of a remote and deadly country which could be looked for, but which could never be reached. The series of ideas which there we have tried to evaluate we now have undertaken to buttress from another side.

JOHN TH. HONTI

Paris

UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF JEAN-BAPTISTE RACINE TO THE ABBÉ RENAUDOT

The following six letters from the eldest son of Jean Racine to the Abbé Renaudot are to be found in one of the volumes of the latter's papers preserved in the manuscript collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris¹ where they are wrongly catalogued as letters from Louis Racine, Jean-Baptiste's younger brother. The first four of these letters are dated from the Hague, where Jean-Baptiste was attached to the French embassy, and were written but a few months after his father's death in April 1699. At that time he had come to Paris where he had been received by the King and granted a pension of a thousand livres². The last two letters were written from Rome where he had gone in the suite of the Cardinal d'Estrées. These letters are interesting not merely for the details which they give regarding the young man's career after he had lost his father's valuable protection, but also for their literary refer-

⁴⁰ *Acta Ethnologica I* cvt

¹ *Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises* 7491.

² P. Mesnard. *Œuvres de Jean Racine* (*Édition des Grands Écrivains de la France*, Revised edition), vii, pp. 340-42, letters from Willard to Préfontaine.

ences, their graphic description of his voyage to Italy, and their account of conditions in Rome during the last months of the life of Innocent XII.

The abbé Renaudot may have been interested in aiding the son of his good friend in part because he could find use for the information which the young Racine might send him from foreign capitals. Renaudot was frequently engaged in compiling *mémoires* for the French foreign minister, especially concerning affairs in England, Spain, and Rome, and he himself went to Rome in the suite of the Cardinal de Noailles only a few months after Racine had made his journey. But it is not necessary to find any selfish motives in his befriending the son of Jean Racine. He had been devoted to the father.³ He had the reputation of being a charitable, witty, sincere, and pious man. A very learned orientalist, he was a member of the *Académie française* and the *Académie des Inscriptions*, and the author of many works on theology and on the oriental branches of the church. It was to him that Bouleau dedicated his *Épître sur l'Amour de Dieu*.

I *

A la Haye le 28^e juillet 1699.

Il y auroit déjà longtems, Monsieur, que je me fusse donné l'honneur de vous escrire depuis que je suis icy, si je n'avois crainct de vous importuner; et si j'eusse cru que mes lettres valussent la peine de détourner une personne de vostre mérite et aussi occupé que vous. Je priay il y a quelque tems Mr Despreaux de vouloir bien vous demander si vous trouveriez bon que je me donnasse cet honneur, mais comme je n'ay point encore receu de response de luy, et que je ne crains rien davantage que de me laisser oublier dans l'esprit d'un amy tel que vous, il faut que vous me pardonniez, si je prends cette liberté aujourd'huy. Un de mes plus grands regrets en partant de Paris a esté assurément de ne pouvoir point aller prendre congé de vous, et vous renouveler tous les remerciements que j'auray a vous faire toute ma vie, mais mon depart fut si brusque, et j'arrivay si tard a Paris, qu'il me fut absolument impossible de pouvoir trouver un moment de tems pour aller jusques chez vous. Quoy que j'aye esté tres innocent la dedans, et que j'aye esté assez puny moy mesme d'estre obligé de partir ainsy sans avoir le plaisir de vous voir, je vous avoue cependant, Monsieur, que je ne

³ See the letter from Racine to Jean-Baptiste Racine, October 24, 1698 "M de Valincourt et M l'abbé Renaudot m'ont tenu la meilleure compagnie du monde je vous les nomme entre autres, parce qu'ils n'ont presque bougé de ma chambre . . ." (Mesnard, *op cit*, viii, p 304.)

⁴ Nouv Acq fr. 7491, fol. 397 This is a single sheet written on both sides There is no address nor seal

laisse pas d'avoir toujours cela sur le cœur Je serois au desespoir que vous pussiez attribuer a ma negligence, l'impuissance ou j'ay esté de ne pouvoir m'acquiescer d'une chose que l'inclination seule me pressoit assez de faire, quand il n'y auroit point toutes les raisons de reconnoissance qui m'y engagent Je voudrois de tout mon cœur, qu'il y eut dans ce pays des choses dignes de vous estre mandees, et qui pussent me fournir des occasions de vous faire quelquefois ressouvenir de moy Si je pouvois vous y estre bon en la moindre chose du monde, je vous prie, Monsieur, de croire, que si vous voulez me faire quelque plaisir c'est de me le mander et de m'y employer M^r de Bonrepaus⁵ me charge de vous faire mille complimens de sa part, je vous supplie, Monsieur, de vouloir bien que je vous demande toujours quelque place dans votre amitié, estant avec tout l'attachement possible, Monsieur, vostre ties humble et tres tres obeissant serviteur

Racine

II *

A la Haye le 9^e 7^{bre} 1699

Je ne crois pas, Monsieur, que personne ayt reçu une lettre qui luy ayt fait plus de plaisir que celle que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'escire, et je ne puis vous dire combien je suis sensible a toutes les marques d'amitié que vous m'y donnez, je m'estimeray assurément bien heureux si je puis jamais m'en rendre aussy digne que j'en suis reconnoissant Il faut estre aussy bon que vous l'estes, pour vouloir bien que je vous escrive quelquefois, n'ayant rien a vous mander qui merite votre attention Je crains seulement que vous ne croyez qu'il n'y ait que de la vanité dans l'envie que j'ay de recevoir de vos nouvelles, car tous ceux qui scauront que je suis en commerce de lettres avec une personne comme vous ne pourront s'empescher de concevoir une haute Idée de mon merite, mais je vous assure neantmoins, qu'il n'y a que le desir que j'ay de me conserver quelque place dans vostre amitié et dans vostre ressouvenir qui m'oblige a vous prier de me faire la grace de me donner quelquefois de vos nouvelles Je montray a M^r de Bonrepaus ce que vous me mandiez touchant la querelle de M^r Despreaux et de la Chapelle⁷ Quoy que plusieurs de ses amis luy en

⁵ François Dusson de Bonrepaus, ambassador of France to the Hague He was frequently mentioned in Racine's correspondence.

⁶ Fols 398, 399 A folded sheet written on four pages No address nor seal

⁷ The dramatist, Jean de La Chapelle (1656-1723), was the "directeur" of the meeting of the Academy during which Valincourt took the place left vacant by the death of Racine La Chapelle is said to have offended Boileau in his remarks, and the latter replied with his epigram against Boyer and La Chapelle

J'approuve que chez vous, messieurs, on examine
Qui du pompeux Corneille ou du tendre Racine
Exit dans Paris plus d'applaudissemens
Mais je voudrais qu'on cherchât tout d'un temps
(La question n'est pas moins belle)

eussent mandé beaucoup de choses, il convint qu'on ne luy avoit rien escrit de plus agreable, ny de plus joli que les quatre lignes de votre (*sic*) lettre qui en parlent, et nous rimes beaucoup de l'irregularité du cours des beaux esprits argentés⁸ Nous n'avions point entendu parler icy de l'histoire de la scission de Pologne,⁹ et nous en avons esté fort etonnés, n'y ayant point de livres qu'on imprime icy plus volontiers que ceux qu'on a deffendus en France On y a imprimé deux volumes du Thelemarque de Mr de Cambray,¹⁰ et on en promet encore trois Ils ont esté extremement courus dans ce pais, si je ne croyois que vous les avez leus, je vous les aurois déjà envoyés, mais s'il y avoit quelque livre icy que vous eussiez envie d'avoir vous me feriez un grand plaisir de m'en charger Il n'y a point icy beaucoup de nouvelles Le bruit court seulement que le Roy de Dann^k¹¹ est mort On dit que le Roy d'Angl sera icy au commencement du mois qui vient, voulant repasser en Angleterre de meilleure heure que l'année passée, pour prevenir s'il peut les affaires que son Parlement luy prepare, et qui luy seront a ce qu'on pretend aussy desagrees que celles qui se passeront l'hyver dernier¹² Milord Portland¹³ se tient toujours icy, et ne pouvant plus estre bon courtisan, il s'est enfin borné a estre bon Republicain¹⁴ Vous voulez bien, Monsieur, me permettre de vous prier de faire mes complimens a Mr Despreaux quand vous le verrez; je suis,

Qui du fide Boyer ou du sec La Chapelle

Exit plus de sifflements

See Boileau *Œuvres complètes*, Gidel edition, III, pp 82 ff

⁸ This phrase is probably a quotation from Renaudot's letter

⁹ From this meagre reference it is impossible to identify the book in question with any certainty May it perhaps be Jolli *Histoire de Pologne et du grand-duché de Lithuanie*, the second edition of which appeared with an Amsterdam imprint in 1699? This book tells of the intrigues of the Abbé de Polignac in Poland and of the failure of the Prince de Conti in his attempts to gain the crown

¹⁰ Fénelon's *Télémaque* was printed at the Hague in four volumes in 1699 after the first Paris edition had been forbidden

¹¹ Christian V of Denmark died August 25, 1699

¹² The previous winter the English parliament had offended William II by a number of measures It had revoked the grants of forfeited estates in Ireland which he had made to his favorites, it had disbanded his Dutch Guards, and it had limited the size of the army

¹³ William Bentwick, first Earl of Portland (1649-1709), the friend and confidential diplomat of William II He had been Ambassador to France and had concluded the treaties for the partition of Spain for which he was later impeached

¹⁴ Portland was so jealous of the growing favor of the Earl of Albemarle that in May 1699 he resigned all of his many offices in the royal household and insisted that he was returning to private life in the country In spite of this, he followed the King to Holland in June and returned with him to England in October

Monsieur, avec toute la reconnaissance et l'inclination possible vostre tres humble et tres obeissant serviteur

Racine.

III ¹⁵

A La Haye, le 2^e Novbre ¹⁶

Je ne sçay en verite, Monsieur, de quels termes je dois me servir pour vous remercier de la generosite et de l'attention avec laquelle vous voulez bien veiller sur ce qui me regarde C'est veritablement en cette occasion que je reconnois que l'on n'est pas toujours maistre d'exprimer tout ce qu'on a dans le cœur, et il faut s'il vous plaist que vous ayez la bonté de suppléer a mon peu d'eloquence Je n'ay jamais tant désiré d'en avoir qu'aujourd'huy, et jamais je ne m'en suis trouve si court, mais qui est celui, qui a ma place ne se tiendroit aussy embarrassé que je le suis a vous marquer toute la reconnaissance que j'en ay? Je ne suis pas le seul qui soit charmé et penetré du soin que vous prenez de moy, M^r de Bonrepas a qui je courus aussitot communiquer la lettre que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'escire l'a ressenti et admiré, comme si c'eut esté luy qui y fust interessé, et peu s'en fallut qu'il ne prit la plume sur le champ pour vous en remercier Il m'a chargé de vous bien remercier de l'honneur de vostre souvenir, et de vous faire mille complimens de sa part

Je luy ay demandé son avis sur tout ce que vous me mandez, et il m'a conseillé d'abord de profiter de l'envie que M^r le M^s de Torcy ¹⁷ vous a temoigné avon de m'envoyer aupres de M^r Obrecht, ¹⁸ et il regarde cela aussy bien que moy, comme une grande marque de la bonté dont il veut m'honorer dans les suites, mais puisque vous me permettez, Monsieur, de vous confier librement mes sentimens et mon inclination sur ce sujet, j'ay crû qu'avant que de m'engager en rien, je devois vous mander naturellement l'estat de mes affaires, afin que vous puissiez mieux juger de ce qui me convient et du party que j'ay a prendre, car je vous avoue que je suis fort incertain la dessus et j'ay grand besoin de vos conseils pour me determiner Je ne balancerai point dans un autre tems a m'en aller a Francfort, mais je ne sçay si je pourrais faire la depense de ce voyage Depuis la mort de mon Pere je n'ay encore touché d'autre argent que mille francs que M^r de Cavoie ¹⁹ m'a fait avoir pour ma course de Paris icy ²⁰ Je ne dois

¹⁵ Fols 408, 409, a folded sheet written on four pages. A fragment of a black wax seal remains

¹⁶ Another hand has written here "1699?"

¹⁷ Jean-Baptiste Colbert, marquis de Torcy et de Sablé, Minister of Foreign Affairs, frequently mentioned by Racine in his correspondence

¹⁸ Ulrich Obrecht (1647-1701), *prêtreur royal* at Strasbourg and a learned jurisconsult and philologist, who had been sent to Frankfurt in 1698 to attend to the affairs of Madame

¹⁹ Louis Oger, marquis de Cavoie, *grand maréchal des logis de la maison du roi*, a great friend of Racine and Boileau, frequently mentioned in the correspondence of the former

²⁰ See n. 2.

toucher le peu de revenu que j'ay que vers le milieu de l'année prochaine, et je seray obligé jusques la de vivre d'un tres grand menage ou d'emprunter, ce qui me mettroit fort en arriere, quelque modique qu'en fut la somme. Voila, Monsieur, la seule raison qui me fait hesiter a suivre la pensée de Mr de Torcy. Vous pouvez bien croire que je n'oseois l'alleguer a d'autres qu'a vous, et je rougis mesme de vous faire entrer dans un aussi petit detail que celui cy. J'ecris cependant aujourd'huy a ma mère pour sçavoir ce qu'elle peut faire pour moy, quoy que je craigne bien qu'avec la famille qu'elle a, elle ne soit pas en estat de m'avancer grande chose. Mr de Torcy me fit l'honneur de me dire en partant, qu'apres le sejour que j'aurois fait icy, il m'envoyeroit a Frankfort, mais j'esperois alors de demeurer plus longtems avec Mr de Bonrepaus, et d'attraper aupres de luy le courant de mon petit revenu, dont je serois obligé de manger pres de la moitié par avance si je m'en allois maintenant en Allemagne. Pour ce qui est de mon goust et de mon inclination, j'eusse fort souhaité que Mr de Torcy eut songé a m'employer seulement du coté de l'Italie. Mr de Bonrepaus tombe d'accord que cela me conviendrait mieux, et je me souviens de vous avoir entendu dire que les emplois d'Allemagne estoient fort ruineux, et en effet n'ayant point plus de bien que j'en ay, et ignorant la langue du Pais,²¹ j'aurois de la peine a y estre agreablement. Mon but seroit donc, s'il y avoit quelqu'uns des envoyés qui sont en Italie aupres desquels je pusse m'instruire des affaires de ce Pays la, de m'y en aller, d'y vivre a mes depens, et de travailler a me rendre utile quelque jour dans ce quartier. Mais apres tout, Monsieur, vous sçavez que je n'ay point de volonté ny a consulter ny a suivre, et je suis trop heureux que l'on veuille faire quelque attention a moy. Ainzy je vous supplie d'avoir la bonté de me faire sçavoir de quelle maniere Mr de Torcy vous a parlé de m'envoyer a Francoit, parce que s'il vous l'a dit pour me le proposer, je n'examine plus rien, et dans quelque lieu que ce soit, deussai je emprunter, je sacrifieray toutes choses pour executer ses ordres, et je serois au desespoir qu'il pût soupçonner le moins du monde que je voulusse choisir avec luy et prendre mes commodités. S'il ne vous (avoit)²² dit cela que comme une simple pensée qui luy fust venue, vous pourriez aisement luy en faire naistre quelque autre, sans qu'il parût que j'y eusse part ny que je fisse aucune difficulté d'accepter ce qu'il m'offiroit, et je crois qu'en ce cas il seroit bon que vous ne fissiez pas semblant avec luy de m'avoir encore rien escrit la dessus. Enfin, Monsieur, avec quelque liberté que je vous expose icy mes sentimens, n'y ayez je vous prie aucun egard. Je m'abandonne entierement a vos conseils, estant bien persuadé que je me trouveray beaucoup mieux de les suivre, que d'ecouter mon inclination. Je puis vous assurer que ma plus grande ambition est de meriter la continua-

²¹ He had been advised by Bonrepaus and Torcy to study German a year before this, and his father had urged him to follow their advice. See Mesnard, *op cit*, vii, p 239.

²² The editor has supplied this word, for the Ms has here been torn by the removal of the seal.

tion de vostre amitié et de pouvoir vous persuader de la reconnaissance infinie et de l'attachement avec lequel je suis et seray toute ma vie vos tres humble et tres obeissant serviteur

Racine

Address A Monsieur Monsieur l'abbé Renaudot chez M^r Bardou aux Galeries du Louvre a Paris

IV ²³

A La Haye, le 10^e Xbre 1699

Je vous demande mille pardons, Monsieur, d'avoir attendu si tard a vous remercier de la dernière Lettre que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'escire, mais je l'eusse déjà fait si je n'avois pas esté incommodé depuis quinze jours d'une espece de petite dysenterie dont j'ay crant les suites et qui m'a obligé de prendre quelques remedes, quoy que je n'en sois pas encore entierement guery, je me porte neantmoins beaucoup mieux et j'espere que ce ne sera rien M^r de Valincourt ²⁴ avoit eü la bonté de me mander l'heureux succes de vos negociations Je ne pouvois souhaitter par rapport a l'estat present de mes affaires autre chose que ce que vous avez conclu a mon egaid Quoy que j'eusse sans peine obey a l'ordre que M^r de Torcy m'eut donné d'aller en Allemagne, je suis cependant plus aise de m'en retourner a Paris pour y avoir soin de mes petites affaires, je vous assure, Monsieur, que le plus grand plaisir que je me propose d'y avoir, est celuy de vous embrasser, et de vous remercier autant que je le dois de toutes vos bontés Il semble que vous mettez les remerciemens que j'ay eü l'honneur de vous en faire, au nombre des complimens ordinaires, mais je vous supplie de croire qu'ils partent du fonds de mon cœur, et que l'on ne peut estre penetré de plus de reconnaissance que je le suis Monsieur le Cardinal d'Estrées ²⁵ me fait bien de l'honneur de vouloir me permettre de le

²³ Fols 406, 407, a folded sheet written on four pages The seal is of black wax stamped with a swan In spite of the fact that this letter precedes number III in the volume of Renaudot's Mss (Nouv Ac Fr 7491), it was certainly written after number III The confusion arose from the abbreviation "Xbre" which was certainly intended for "décembre"

²⁴ J.-B.-H du Troussel de Valincourt (1653-1730), the protégé of the poet Racine and his successor in the Academy and in the office of royal historian It was in his house that Racine's historical manuscripts were burned Jean-Baptiste Racine in his later life never forgave de Valincourt for his letter to the abbé d'Olivet which the latter published in his *Histoire de l'Académie française*, II, pp 337 ff See the letter from J.-B. Racine to Louis Racine in Mesnard, *op cit.*, VII, pp 348 ff

²⁵ César, cardinal d'Estrées (1628-1714), was frequently charged with diplomatic missions by Louis XIV At the time this letter was written, he was about to go to Rome where Innocent XII was thought to be on his death bed Louis sent him ahead of the other French cardinals because the fantastic actions of the Cardinal de Bouillon and of the French ambas-

suivre quand il ira a Rome, j'ay toujours aspiré apres cela, et je feray tout mon possible pour me rendre digne des bontés qu'il veut avoir pour moy Je n'ay osé prendre la liberté de luy ecrire la dessus, mais j'ay prié M^r de Valincourt de luy en faire mes tres humbles remerciemens quand il en trouvera l'occasion, et vous voulez bien que je vous demande la mesme grace, lorsque vous le verrez

Je crois, Monsieur, que j'auray bientost le plaisir de vous voir, M^r de Bonrepaus prit hier son audience de congé et partira au premier jour.²⁶ Vous verrez dans la Gazette de ce pais cy le compliment qu'il a fait a M^{rs} les Estats Generaux, il y a esté enseié mot pour mot, et tout le monde l'a trouvé fort bien tourné M^r de Bonrepaus m'a chargé de vous faire mille complimens de sa part J'ay grande envie d'estre a Paris, pour pouvoir avoir l'honneur de vous entretenir quelquefois, et vous temoigner toute la reconnoissance que je conserveray toute (ma vie des)²⁷ obligations que je vous ay Je vous supplie, Monsieur, de croire qu'on ne peut rien ajouter a l'attachement avec lequel je suis vostre tres humble et tres obeissant serviteur

Racine

Address A Monsieur Monsieur l'abbé Renaudot a Paris

V²⁸

A Rome le 23^e Mars 1700

Vous aurez sans doute esté surpris, Monsieur, de n'avoir pas encore receu de mes nouvelles, me croyant deja peut estre depuis longtemps a Rome Il est viay qu'il y a un mois naturellement que je devois y estre, mais je n'y suis arrivé que mercredy dernier, quoy que Monsieur le Cardinal d'Estrées soit resté a dix lieues d'icy, dans une maison de campagne de M^r le Duc de Lanti²⁹ Il y attend depuis huit ou dix jours M^{rs} les Cardinaux de Janson³⁰ et de Coislín,³¹ qui en débarquant a Ligourne s'y sont trouvés

sador, the Prince of Monaco, were creating a great scandal See Saint-Simon, *Mémoires*, "Grands écrivains" edition, VII, p 13 See also n 43

²⁶ A note in Saint-Simon, *op cit* (IV, p 281, n 4), says that Bonrepaus returned from the Hague in October We see from this letter that he did not He had requested to be replaced and his successor had been named in October See Saint-Simon, *op cit*, VI, p 355

²⁷ The words in parentheses are supplied by the editor, the MS having been torn in this place by the seal

²⁸ Fols. 420, 421, a folded sheet written on four sides The seal has been torn off, leaving a mere fragment of black wax

²⁹ Antoine Lanti delle Rovere, duc de Bomarse, brother-in-law of Mme des Ursins, a great friend of the Cardinal d'Estiées The Cardinal arrived in Rome the day after this letter was written

³⁰ Toussaint de Forbin, Cardinal de Janson (1630-1713), had been ambassador to Poland and to Rome, and became chargé d'affaires again in Rome in 1700.

³¹ Pierre du Cambout, Cardinal de Coislín (1636-1706), *grand aumônier de France*

errumes tous les deux, et ont esté obligés de s'y reposer de toutes leurs fatigues Pour moy, j'ay desespere bien des fois de pouvoir jamais ariver a Rome Je fus toujours malade en allant de Paris à Lion,³² et cela m'empescha de pouvoir suivre Mr le Cardinal a Turin,³³ n'ayant pas osé m'hasarder de passer avec mon incommodité les montagnes de Savoye Je m'en allay tout doucement a Antibes pour m'embarquer sui les Galeres, qui estoient parties de Marseilles depuis quinze jours sans pouvoir avancer a cause du mauvais tems Je les attendis cinq ou six jours, et a la fin l'impatience m'ayant pris, je m'en allay a Genes dans une petite felouque³⁴ J'y trouvay Mr le Cardinal, qui se lassant d'attendre aussy les Galeres monta dans une fregatte du Roy qui estoit dans le port de Genes pour aller a Ligourne Nous eûmes le premier jour le vent fort bon mais le lendemain il cessa tout a fait, et estant ensuite devenu contraire, nous obligea a revenir a Genes Mr le Cardinal s'en alla des le lendemain matin par terre au travers des montagnes dans une chaise a porteurs, et nous dit de prendre une felouque, la mer ne nous fut pas plus favorable qu'auparavant Elle devint si grosse que nous fumes trop heureux de pouvoir nous refugier dans un mechant village sur la coste ou nous restâmes quatre jours entiers, et le mauvais tems durant toujours, nous passâmes a pied l'espace de deux bonnes lieues les montagnes qui sont sur le bord de la mer, pour gagner un Bourg ou nous pussions trouver des chaises et des chevaux Voila, Monsieur, la relation de mon voyage, qui m'a comme vous le jugez bien, fort ennuyé et beaucoup coute, l'ayant fait depuis Lion jusques icy entiere ment a mes depens Si je ne m'estois pas obstiné a suivre toujours de pres Mr le Cardinal, je serois icy depuis longtems Il a pris pour se loger le Palais de Mr le Duc de Lanti, il a eû la bonté de m'y donner une chambre Il y loge aussy (M^{rs} les)³⁵ Chevaliers de Charost,³⁶ d'Avaux,³⁷ Mr³⁸ de Mouchy son neveu, Mr D'Udicourt,³⁹ et le fils du Procureur General du Parlement de Besançon, nommé Mr de Vair⁴⁰ Je fus bien fâché de ne pouvoir pas avoir l'honneur de vous dire adieu a Paris, je ne reçus la lettre que vous m'escriviste, qu'a huit heures du soir, ayant diné ce jour la en

³² They had left on January 23 See Saint-Simon, *op cit*, VII, p 14, n 9.

³³ See Saint-Simon, *op cit*, VII, pp 14-15

³⁴ Here "*que je*" has been written and then crossed out

³⁵ The words in parentheses are supplied by the editor, the MS having been torn in this place by the removal of the seal

³⁶ Probably Louis-Basile, son of Armand de Béthune, duc de Charost

³⁷ Jean-Jacques de Mesmes (1675-1741) Chevalier de Saint Jean de Jérusalem, son of the Comte d'Avaux

³⁸ The MS is torn here Marguerite d'Estrées, aunt of the Cardinal, had married Gabriel de Bournel de Namps, Baron de Mouchy

³⁹ This reading is not absolutely certain

⁴⁰ Probably Jean-Antoine Boisot de Vaure See Seguin de Jallerange, *Liste des Présidents et Conseillers au Parlement de Besançon*, Besançon, 1858, in-4°

Ville, et je passay toute la nuit debout, a preparer le peu de hardes que j'emportoys avec moy, mais je priay ma mere de vous en envoyer faire mes excuses le lendemain Je suis toujours, Monsieur, avec toute la reconnaissance et l'attachement possible entierement a vous

Racine

Le S Pere se porte toujours bien

Address A Monsieur Monsieur Bardou aux Galeries du Louvre, pour faire tenir s'il luy plaist a Monsieur l'abbé Renaudot

VI ⁴¹

A Rome le 24^e Aoust 1700

J'ay reçu, Monsieur, la Lettre que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'escire le 12^e du mois passe J'y eusse repondu plustost si je ne craignois de vous importuner par de trop frequentes Lettres Je m'estime si heureux que vous voulez bien que je vous escrive quelquefois, que j'apprehende toujours d'en abuser Mr de Valincourt a enfin rompu le silence qu'il avoit garde avec moy si longtems J'ay reçu deux Lettres de luy toutes pleines de bontés Il se plaint beaucoup du grand nombre d'affaires qu'il a, et qui ne luy permettent pas de jour de sa maison de campagne ⁴² autant qu'il se l'estoit promis Je ne sçay s'il vous aura communiqué le projet d'un ouviage qu'il m'impose et qu'il pretend luy devoir estre d'une grande utilite, mais il faudroit pour cela que ce fut un autre que moy qu'il en chargeat, vous en jugerez vous mesme, et je ne doute pas que vous ne le trouviez aussy bien que moy fort audessus de mes forces Il me demande une relation exacte de toute la Cour de Rome, a commencer depuis le Pape jusqu'au dernier des Cardinaux, dont il veut que je luy describe non seulement les âges, les noms, leurs maisons et le tems de leurs promotions, mais encore tous leurs interets, leur Doctrine, leurs humeurs, leurs liaisons, et enfin toutes leurs bonnes et mauvaises qualités Voila assuement un tres beau, et tres vaste sujet, mais je ne sçay si le Roy demandoit une pareille chose a ses ministres, s'ils pouvoient bien repondre de s'en acquitter comme il faut Mr de Valincourt a sans doute une grande Idee de ma capacité et de mon experience pour me proposer une telle entreprise Je souhaiterois de tout mon cœur pouvoir y repondre, mais il faudroit estre un peu plus habille que je ne suis Je le tenteray neantmoins quoy qu'il y ait a cela beaucoup de temerité, et quelque mal que je reussisse mieux il verra du moins que ce n'est ny la bonne-volonté ny l'envie de me rendre digne de ses bontes qui me manque

Je ne sçauroids assez vous remercier, Monsieur, de la bonté que vous avez de vouloir bien faire ma cour vous mesme a Monsieur le Cardinal Il me felicite souvent d'avoir un amy et un Patron tel que vous, et quand il est sur vostre sujet, il ne finit pas aisement, et l'on voit qu'il parle du fonds

⁴¹ Fols 427, 428, a folded sheet written on four sides. The seal is of black wax stamped with a swan

⁴² Is this perhaps the house in Saint Cloud which burned in January 1726? It was in this fire that Racine's manuscripts perished

du cœur Pour luy, il n'y a qu'a le connoistre pour l'aimer, et je n'oubli-
ray jamais l'obligation que je vous ay d'avoir l'honneur d'estre aupres de
luy

Rien ne manque plus comme vous sçavez a la disgrace de Mr le Cardinal
de Bouillon ⁴³ Mr l'Ambassadeur ⁴⁴ a este luy demander son cordon bleu,
et la demission de sa charge, qu'il n'a pas cependant voulu donner encore
jusques a ce qu'il eut escrit luy mesme au Roy Mr de Monaco ne s'acquita
de cette commission que huit jours apres en avoir reçu l'ordre Il luy dit
mesme en allant le luy porter, qu'il estoit encore tems d'oheir et que s'il
vouloit partir, on ne pousseroit point les choses a la derniere extremite
On a deffendu a tous les François qui sont icy d'avoir aucun commerce avec
luy Le Cardinal Negroni ⁴⁵ qui est un espeece de fou, luy a, dit-on, offert
cent mille écus d'argent comptant C'est un homme qui passe sa vie
enfermé dans une vigne a composer des Libelles et des satires contre la
France, qui ne font pas, comme vous pouvez penser, un grand effet icy

Le Pere le Conte ⁴⁶ est arrive a Rome Il dit que les nouvelles qu'on a
fait courir de sa pretendue disgrace l'ont fort divertit en chemin et qu'il y
avoit trois mois qu'il sollicitoit avec ardeur son voyage, qu'il espere devoir
estre d'une grande utilité a la compagnie Il se promet de faire des
merveilles dans la Congregation du St Office, et de lever tous les embarras
ou l'on est icy au sujet de l'affaire de la Chine ⁴⁷

Vous me sursprenez fort, Monsieur, en me mandant que Mr Despreaux
est devenu le protecteur des Financiers *Quantum mutatus ab illo Ectore* ⁴⁸
Il faut que ce soient les disgraces dont ils ont esté menacés qui l'ayent
attendry en leur faveur Je vous prie cependant d'empescher qu'ils s'em-
parent seuls de luy et qu'ils luy fassent oublier ses anciens amis ⁴⁹

⁴³ Emmanuel-Théodose de la Tour d'Auvergne (1643-1715) For details
concerning his disgrace see Saint-Simon, *op cit*, VII, pp 82-83, 86, 99-106,
154-158, 196-198, 199

⁴⁴ Louis Grimaldi, Prince de Monaco (1642-1701) He had been ambas-
sador since 1698

⁴⁵ Cardinal Negroni (1628-1713) was created cardinal in 1686 During
the last of his life he lived in retirement in his "vigne de Montalte"
(Moréri)

⁴⁶ Louis Leconte, Jesuit astronomer and mathematician

⁴⁷ Leconte had been a missionary in China in 1685, and on his return
wrote his *Nouveaux Mémoires sur l'état présent de la Chine* and a letter
to the duc de Maine "Sur les Cérémonies de la Chine" In these works he
praised the morality of the Chinese and maintained that they had known
the true God for 2000 years These books were denounced by his enemies
and submitted to the judgment of Rome in 1700 Leconte demanded that
he be allowed to defend them before a full Congregation, but permission was
refused. His works were condemned by the Faculty of Paris on October
18, 1700

⁴⁸ Virgil, *Aeneid*, II, 274

⁴⁹ Boileau's intimacy with Pierre Le Verrier was apparently beginning
about this time. Le Verrier, who was called "Le Traitant renouvelé des

Tout ce que vous me mandez de Mr l'abbé de la Forest⁵⁰ m'a fait un pla (isir)⁵¹ infiny c'est le meilleur amy que j'aye icy, et nous parlons souvent ensembles de belles Lettres et de Grec qu'il possède parfaitement bien, mais ce que j'estime encor plus que cela, c'est la bonte de son cœur, car c'est un des bons et des solides amis qu'on puisse avoir

Le Pape⁵² est plus mal que jamais Il ieut hier le viatique, et il n'y a quasi plus d'esperance qu'il puisse en revenu On parloit hier au soir d'un Consistoire pour les trois Cardinaux reserves in petto, mais il n'y en eut point et on ne croit pas mesme qu'il y en ait, pai des raisons que vous sçavez mieux que moy

Vous ne m'avez rien mandé de Mr de Torey, cependant j'avois grande envie de sçavoir si je pourrois me flatter d'estre quelquefois dans son souvenir Permettez moy de vous demander toujours une place dans le vostre, et faites moy la grace de croire qu'on ne peut estre avec plus d'attachement que je le suis votre tres humble et tres obeissant serviteur⁵³

Address A Monsieur Monsieur l'abbé Renaudot a la Porte de Richelieu
A Paris

F. K. TURGEON

Amherst College

Grecs," was a financier who wanted to be a poet, wit, and *homme à bonnes fortunes* He first met Boileau in 1688, but he could not get him to talk about his work until 1701, he says in the preface to his commentary on the *Satires* (*Les Satires de Boileau commentées par lui-même Reproduction du commentaire inédit de Pierre Le Verrier*, Ed F Lachèvre) In Brossette's *Journal* (Bib Nat MS Fonds Fr 15275, fol 37 v) we read under the date of Oct 22, 1702 "Nous avons dîné chez Mr le Verrier qui est un homme d'esprit et de mérite, et pardessus cela, un fort riche financier Il demeure dans la vieille rue du Temple, mais il doit bientôt changer de logement" Other guests present included the Marquis de Segur, and "Mr Delacroix, homme d'affaires, ou financier très riche" One man who had been invited, a painter, did not appear but dined with Mme Racine instead Boileau was thus becoming more and more intimate with the kind of man whom he had satirized frequently (see *Sat*, I, 34-41, VIII, 181-210, IX, 159-164, Epître I, 137, V, 97-98) Later Le Vernier purchased Boileau's home in Auteuil, allowing him to continue to occupy it until his death According to Louis Racine this arrangement was the source of a quarrel between the two men (see Mesnard, *op cit*, I, 359) There are numerous references to Le Verrier in Boileau's correspondence

⁵⁰ Perhaps La Forest de Bourgon, the author of several works on the geography of the ancient world

⁵¹ The letters in parentheses are supplied by the editor, the MS being torn in this place

⁵² Innocent XII died on Sept. 27, 1700.

⁵³ This letter is signed only with a flourish, but there can be no doubt that it was written by J-B Racine.

UNEDITED VOLTAIRE LETTERS TO COUNT DI POLCENIGO

Count Giorgio di Polcenigo e Fanna derives his name from two feudal castles, the castle of Polcenigo which his forebears had owned since the rule of Emperor Otto I, and the castle of Fanna built several centuries later by Lodovico di Polcenigo. The title of "count palatine" was bestowed upon the family in 1469.¹ Giorgio was born on December 3, 1715 at Cavasso in the province of Friuli, attended the University of Padua and spent some time travelling in France.² One of the early products of his pen, a work of erudition, *De' nobili, de' parlamenti e de' feudi saggi del Conte Giorgio di Polcenigo e Fanna*, Venice, 1761, is characterized by F. di Manzano as "virile . . . useful and worthy of being consulted."³ Shortly afterwards he married Angela Sambonifacio. Apparently a domestic atmosphere was just what he needed to stimulate his writing instincts, for the bulk of his literary output falls between 1764 and 1780, and includes *Il viaggio concineo* (1764), *La lettera precipitata* (1764), *Il tempio della gloria* printed at Udine in 1765, *Fra Simone* (1767), *L'imeneo cusano* (1770) and *Il tempio d'imeneo*⁴ printed at Udine in 1773, to mention only the longer and the most significant of his compositions. Most of these are mock heroic poems in which the author avowedly followed the traces of Lucian,⁵ but, unfortunately, not one has had sufficient merit to be mentioned in the histories of literature. Professor Natali in his *Settecento*, for instance, finds a nook for many of the secondary writers of the period, but no place for Polcenigo. However, evidence of a considerable amount of local popularity is made clear by the existence of quite a number of manuscripts containing his poems, which are to be found in the Biblioteca Comunale Vincenzo Joppi at Udine, the provincial capital of Friuli.⁶ Furthermore, he

¹ Cf. G. B. di Crollalanza *Dizionario storico blasonico* I, Pisa, 1886.

² Cf. the anonymous "Vita del Co. Giorgio di Polcenigo e Fanna" (sic) ff. 2-3v of ms. 281 in the Biblioteca Comunale Vincenzo Joppi of Udine.

³ *Cenni biografici dei letterati ed artisti friulani* Udine, 1885.

⁴ Reprinted per nozze Menotti Pizzati Udine, 1838.

⁵ In the composition "Sotto il ritratto del Sig. Co. Giorgio di Polcenigo fatto da lui stesso" (Joppi ms. 281, f. 55v) compare the initial line *Amò questi su l'orme di Luciano*.

⁶ See mss. 23, 117, 165, 166, 169-72, 281-84.

probably had personal contacts as well as epistolary exchanges with the best known literary figures of the epoch such as Saverio Bettinelli, Melchior Cesarotti, G. B. Roberti and Metastasio.⁷ Voltaire he regrets that he has never met, but like many of the writers of his day he was eager to win the approval of the literary arbiter of the eighteenth century. The three unedited letters, in all likelihood the only ones addressed to him by the aging "sage of Ferney," refer, in fact, exclusively to works sent by him to Voltaire. Two of these are contained in their French text in ms. 282 (ff 1364-65) of the Joppi Library, the first being an answer to a French letter written by Polcenigo and preserved in the same manuscript (f. 1363). I have not been able to find the French original of the third letter which exists in an Italian translation in the *Biblioteca Comunale* of Como, *op. cit.* The Como manuscript also bears the information that the pieces contained therein have been copied from another manuscript which once formed part of the "*Biblioteca Bartolana, unita alla Vescovile di Udine.*" Perhaps some one will be more successful in locating it than I have been. A transcript of the letters in question follows.

A Monsieur Voltaire, gentilhomme de la chambre du roi

Aux Délices par Genève

J'ai l'honneur de vous présenter, Monsieur, mes essais sur les nobles, les parlemens et les fiefs. C'est un petit ouvrage, que j'ai fait à l'occasion de quelques erreurs, qui ont été débitées sur les nobles, les parlemens et les fiefs en général, et qui attaquoient directement la nature de ceux de Friul, c'est à dire, de ma patrie. Le suffrage du public m'a fait espérer, qu'il n'en seroit tout à fait indigne d'être présenté au plus grand génie du siècle. Mais c'est votre jugement sur lequel je compte le plus, et que je désire sans [. . .] le moindre ménagement. Pardonnez, Monsieur, si j'ose dérober quelques momens aux idées admirables qui vous occupent.

Je me fais un vrai plaisir de vous annoncer que votre nom est aussi connu, et aussi respecté dans nos contrées que je l'ai trouvé respecté et connu en France et ailleurs. Heureux, si je me pouvois entretenir avec vous, et vous admirer de près! Je vous supplie en attendant de vouloir

⁷ Cf. for example, ms. 57 of the *Biblioteca Comunale di Como* entitled *Poesie del conte Giorgio Polcenigo. Copie di lettere a lui dirette da Saverio Bettinelli (Mantova, 1778), da Melchior Cesarotti (Padova, 1778), da G. B. Roberti (Bassano, 1778), dal Voltaire (Ferney, 1763, 1766)*. A letter from Metastasio, *Lettera al Conte Giorgio di Polcenigo* was published by A. Caralti at Udine, 1878.

bien m'honorer de vos commissions et de croire que je suis avec toute considération et empressement

de Fanne, 15 fev 1763

Votre très humble et très
obéissant serviteur,
Le comte de Polcenigo et Fanne

A Monsieur le Conte de Polcenigo et Fanne

Je vous suis doublement redevable, vous m'avez honoré d'un très beau présent, et vous m'avez instruit J'étois déjà persuadé que les fiefs héréditaires avoient été connus dans toute l'Europe longtemps avant Charlemagne, et cela est bien naturel Des Hérules, des Goths, des Huns, des Vandales qui s'en vont de compagnie et de chasse ne sont pas d'humeur à perdre l'apanage qu'ils ont fait des dépouilles J'ai toujours été de cette opinion Vous l'avez mise au plus grand jour La science et la raison vous ont également servi Je vous demande pardon, monsieur, de ne vous pas écrire de ma main, mais j'ai soixante et dix ans, je suis malade, et presque aveugle Voici de trop fortes raisons J'ai l'honneur d'être avec l'estime la plus respectueuse

Des Délices au près de Genève,
21 mars 1763

Votre très humble et
très obéissant serviteur,
Voltaire, gentilhomme de
la chambre du roi

A Monsieur le Comte de Polcenigo et Fanne

Au Château de Ferney par Genève,
25 mars 1766

Monsieur,

Je vous remercie de la seconde consolation que vous me donnez dans mes maux et dans ma vieillesse Je ne suis pas étonné que vous ayez si bien peint le palais de la gloire⁸ Vous avez imité Pline qui dans les *Lettres* fait une belle description de la maison de campagne On peint toujours fort bien les endroits qu'on habite Je reçois aussi un petit poème manuscrit de Mr le Comte Nolini⁹ Je ne sais si mes yeux qui sont affaiblis

⁸ This reference is, of course, to *Il tempio della gloria*

⁹ Voltaire has been wilfully misled, for Comte Nolini is none other than Polcenigo himself The poem referred to is either *Il viaggio concineo* or *La lettiera precipitata*, which together with *Fra Simone*, veil their real authorship behind this pseudonym Incidentally, Polcenigo used other names de plume E g in the *Sconciatura estemporanea di stanze semibernesche* he assumes the name of Annibale d'Hannover Cf ms 171, *op cit* On the other hand, in *Il Caffè* (ms. 172, *op cit*) the authorship of which is not very clear, he chooses to call himself Angelica Janesi.

pouront le lire, j'y feroi mes efforts pour avoir un nouveau plaisir Je vous prie de lui présenter mes remerciemens et de recevoir les miens J'ai l'honneur d'être avec toute la reconnaissance, Monsieur,

Votre très humble et très
obéissant serviteur,
Voltaire

Dal Castello di Ferney-Ginevra,
28 maggio 1766

Approfitto dell'occasione dei paesani de' vostri contorni, fedeli portatori delle vostre lettere, per dirvi, o signore, che mi son fatto leggere il piccolo poema del Sig^{or} Conte Nolini, e gli altri in seguito che voi m'avete fatto l'onore d'inviarli

Io ho rimarcato in questi leggiadri componimenti e i comici dei tratti graziosi ed originali Vi dirò schiettamente su di essi in due parole che il Friuli non deve punto invidiare alla Senna ed al Tamigi i suoi Boileau e i suoi Pope Io sarei felice di potervi assicurare a viva voce della rispettosissima stima, colla quale ho l'onore di essere

Umil mo e obbed mo servo,
Voltaire

The first two letters are rather non-committal and evasive about showering praises upon Polcenigo's brain-children, while the third seems too eulogistic to be taken seriously. Whether this attitude rankled in the Count's bosom, or whether a change of front came as the result of a possible religious conversion,¹⁰ I do not know. At any rate, soon after Voltaire's death he wrote two uncomplimentary epitaphs in which the Frenchman is called a creature of the devil who in Hell has found a most worthy resting place. It will be of interest to reproduce these verses.

Sulla tomba di Volter
Epitaffio

Se di trovar qui credi o passaggier
L'aride ossa di Volter
Tu t'inganni va più abbasso,
Che con l'alma le volse Satanasso

(Ms 282, f 153, op cit)

¹⁰ This may partly be deduced from the fact that two of his daughters, Teresa and Francesca, took the veil, one of them in 1781, and the other a year or so earlier Cf the compositions written by Polcenigo on these occasions, which are contained in ms 282 of the Joppi Library

Per lo stesso soggetto

D'Averno il ministro assai giulivo,
 Ieri attendeva di Volter l'arrivo,
 E di locarlo nel più nobil posto,
 Avea Minosse cogli editti imposto
 Poichè diceva che in quell'ampio regno
 Non v'era alcuno di Volter più degno
 Tragico illustre, istorico imperfetto,
 Filosofo ignorante, empio perfetto *Op cit f 153*

Quite amusing is a composition captioned *Per la morte di Russò*, which indirectly also concerns Voltaire.

Sdegnossi il gran Russò che pria di lui
 Fatto avesse Volter ne' regni bui
 Solenne ingresso, ed invocò la morte
 Che tosto il conducesse a quelle porte
 Essa fu pronta, e su quell'ampie soglie
 Satano istesso con Volter l'accoglie.
 Venirgl'incontio quei, che i figli loro
 Dell'*Emilio* educar dietto il lavoro,
 E quei che sovra un pian novello e raro
 La natura dei bruti invidiaro
 Ed in quel giorno si son fatti amici
 Russò e Volter, che pria eran nemici *Op cit f 154*

JOSEPH G. FUCILLA

Northwestern University

DEUX LETTRES INEDITES DE FONTENELLE A
 NEWTON

La Société Royale de Londres (The Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge) possède dans ses archives, sous la cote M. M. V. 47, 48, deux lettres de Fontenelle à Newton qui, selon toute apparence, sont demeurées inédites. Différentes de la lettre reproduite par David Brewster dans *Memoirs of sir Isaac Newton* (Edinburgh, 1855, 2 vol., II, 518), elles ne figurent dans aucune édition des *Oeuvres complètes* de Fontenelle et n'ont jamais fait non plus, à notre connaissance, l'objet d'une publication séparée. Avec la gracieuse permission des autorités de la Société Royale,

nous les reproduisons ici comme une fiche additionnelle au dossier des relations intellectuelles franco-anglaises au début du XVIII^e siècle

I Monsieur

Je suis chargé par l'Académie Royale des Sciences de vous remercier d'un Recueil de différentes pièces de vous, qu'elle a reçu des mains de M le Chevalier de Louville¹ je vous rends aussi en mon particulier ties humbles graces de votre nouvelle édition des Principes,² que j'ai reçue de M Taylor³ je vous suis d'autant plus obligé de m'avoir honore d'un si beau présent, que je n'avois aucun droit de m'y attendre je ne le pouvois mériter tout au plus que par l'admiration que j'ai pour tous vos ouvrages, mais elle m'est commune avec tout ce qu'il y a de gens au monde, qui ont quelque teinture de géométrie, et il s'en faut même beaucoup que je sois assés habile pour vous admirer comme il faudroit j'espère que ma reconnoissance suppléera à tout, et je vous supplie d'être bien persuadé que je suis avec une vénération singulière,

Monsieur,

votre très humble et très

obéissant serviteur

fontenelle

de Paris ce 9 juin 1714

sec perp de l'Ac Roy des Sc

II Monsieur

L'Académie Royale des Sciences m'a charge de vous remercier très humblement de la traduction françoise de votre Optique,⁴ qu'elle reçut hier par M Varignon,⁵ vous sàvez ce que toute l'Europe savante pense d'un ouvrage

¹ Jacques Eugène d'Allonville, chevalier de Louville (1671-1732), connu pour ses travaux astronomiques, membre de l'Académie des Sciences (1714), entretenait, depuis la paix d'Utrecht, des relations épistolaires avec plusieurs savants anglais, en particulier Hans Sloane Il fut élu membre de la Société Royale de Londres, le 9 juin 1715, pendant le séjour qu'il fit en Angleterre pour y observer une éclipse solaire

² La seconde édition, "auctior et emendatior," des *Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica*, publiée par Roger Cotes à Cambridge en 1713, et réimprimée à Amsterdam en 1714

³ Brook Taylor (1685-1731), mathématicien anglais, disciple de Newton, avait été mis en rapports avec l'Académie des Sciences par l'intermédiaire de son ami français, Remond de Monmort

⁴ La traduction de Coste, publiée d'abord à Amsterdam (P Humbert, 2 vol in-12) en 1720, puis rééditée sous une forme "beaucoup plus correcte que la première" à Paris en 1722 (Montalant, in-4°)

⁵ Le célèbre mathématicien Pierre Varignon (1654-1722), membre de l'Académie des Sciences depuis 1688, avait été élu membre de la Société Royale de Londres le 29 juillet 1714

si original, si ingénieux, si digne de vous, mais l'Académie, qui vous conte pour un de ses membres,⁶ en sent le mérite, et le loue avec un intérêt plus particulier je suis

Monsieur
votre très humble et très
obeissant serviteur
fontenelle
sec perp de l'Ac Roy des Sc

Trouvés bon, Monsieur, qu'aux remerciemens de l'Académie, je joigne aussi les miens pour l'exemplaire que j'ai reçu de votre part je ne puis assés vous exprimer combien je suis sensible à l'honneur que me fait un homme tel que vous, lorsqu'il se souvient de moi d'une manière si obligeante quand vous ne feriez que savoir mon nom j'en serois très glorieux, et conteroies pour un extreme bonheur qu'il eust été jusqu'à vous j'ai été aussi infiniment touché de l'avoir trouvé dans la préface de M Coste, ⁷ il faudra donc qu'on le connoisse, puisqu'il est dans un ouvrage du grand M. Newton. j'en ai une très vive reconnaissance pour M Coste, qui ne pouvoit jamais me faire un plus grand honneur, mais je sens aussi que je vous doi beaucoup, Monsieur, de ce que vous avés eu la bonté d'y consentir

G. BONNO

The University of California

DRYDEN'S USE OF SCUDÉRY'S *ALMAHIDE*

Prefacing his fine edition of Dryden's *The Conquest of Granada* ¹ with a scathing attack on Langbaine's discussion of Scudéry's ² *Almahide* (1660-3) as a source of Dryden's play, ³ Mr. Montague Summers quotes at length from Part III, Book III, of the English translation by J. Phillips. ⁴ Apparently he did not realize that this portion of the romance is not Scudéry's at all but that it is the

⁶ Newton avait été le premier associé étranger élu par l'Académie des Sciences au moment de sa réorganisation en 1699

⁷ Dans sa préface Coste loue la clarté et l'agrément des ouvrages de Fontenelle

¹ *Dryden, the Dramatic Works*, III, 9, the Nonesuch Press, London, 1932.

² My reasons for attributing *Almahide* to Scudéry rather than to his sister are stated in my *Georges de Scudéry's Almahide*, now in press, to be published by the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore

³ *An Account of English Dramatic Poets*, Oxford, 1691, pp. 157 f.

⁴ *Almahide or the Captive Queen*, London, 1677

creation of Phillips himself. *Almahide* was left unfinished by Scudéry, evidently the translator added an ending for the purpose of satisfying English readers and in order that his labors in translating it might not go unrewarded because of the psychological disadvantage of offering an unfinished work to the public. Summers does not take into consideration the fact that Dryden's play, produced in 1670-71, antedates the Phillips translation. Dryden, therefore, must have made use of the French original in his minor borrowings, for, so far as I know, there was no translation earlier than Phillips's. This disregard of chronology leads Summers to the error of stating that "from *Almahide*, . . . Dryden has borrowed the details of the recognition of Almanzor as his son by the Duke of Arcos, when they are about to meet in mortal fray" (p. 6). As the incident occurs only in Phillips's addition, it would seem to me that the translator of *Almahide* is here indebted to Dryden. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that both in Phillips and Dryden (p. 101), Boabdil makes a last effort to save his tottering throne by commanding *Almahide* to send for her lover and beseech him to cast his lot with the king against his enemies. In Phillips the Sultana goes to her lover's camp in person; in Dryden she sends a messenger for him. The endings of both play and novel are essentially the same: the king is killed in battle; *Almahide* becomes a Christian and will wed her lover. For these two points Dryden is apparently indebted to *Las Guerras civiles de Granada* of Pérez de Hita.

As for the criticisms Summers makes of Langbaine's work, I find that most of those he includes are just. However, I have found one minor point in his criticism which is not justified. After referring to Dryden's lines in the opening act of Part I in which the latter describes the factions in the city of Granada, he quotes from Langbaine: "The next four Lines spoken by the King is (*sic*) taken from Mussa's advice in *Almahide*, p. 6." He then comments that "This reference is simply meaningless." The lines to which he is apparently referring are the following:

Draw up behind the *Vivarambla* place;
Double my guards, these factions I will face,
And try if all the fury they can bring
Be proof against the presence of their King.

I find in the original the following advice given by Moussa to Boabdil:

Mon sens est donc, que V M sorte avecque ses Gardes & qu'elle aille faire tomber les Armes des mains à ces Furieux, par la crainte respectueuse, que donne à des Sujets reuoltez, la presence de leur Souuerain ⁵

Again attacking Langbaine's evidence that the episode of Ozmyn and Benzayda is based on Mlle de Scudéry's *Ibrahim*, Summers says

The flight of Ozmyn and Benzayda is certainly not borrowed from Mlle de Scudéry's *Ibrahim*, but on the other hand Dryden used to very good purpose and vastly improved certain incidents in "*The Sequele of the History of Osman and Alibeck*" (*Ibrahim*, translated by Henry Cogan, London, folio, 1652, pp 194-205), Part IV, Book 4 ⁶

In regard to this statement, it should be pointed out that Scudéry made use of this episode in his play *Axiane* and yet again in the *Almahide*. In the latter work it appears as the intercalated *histoire* of Abdalla and Fatime (vi, 2581 f.). Therefore, if Dryden made use of *Almahide* at all, there would have been no need for him to have gone to *Ibrahim* for his inspiration since the episode is included in *Almahide*.

JEROME W. SCHWEITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

A PORTUGUESE ADAPTATION OF LA CALPRENÈDE'S *FARAMOND*

The influence of La Calprenède's *Faramond* reached not only into England, Holland, Germany, and Italy,¹ but also into Portugal, where the love story of Rosemonde, Queen of the Cimbrians, and Faramond, reputed founder of the French monarchy, is repeated in the play, *A Constancia tudo vence*, Lisboa, Domingos Gonsalves, 1786. The debt of this anonymous play to the French novel, in its turn indebted to Corneille's *Cid*, is apparent. Many of the scenes of the play have parallels in the *Cid*, by circumstance, and in *Faramond*, by design. The similarity in dramatic effect and

⁵ *Almahide*, I, 36

⁶ *Op cit*, p 12

¹ Cf Spire Pitou, Jr, *La Calprenède's Faramond*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938, pp. 168-172

in plot is clearly seen in the basic situations of all three works. The borrowings in the evolved action are striking. There is no doubt as to the anonymous Portuguese playwright's familiarity with the French novel.² Proof is furnished as early as the opening scenes of the play when it is revealed that Faramundo has slain Rozimunda's brother, Esveno. She swears vengeance Faramundo, entering the Cimbrian capital as an ally of the conquering Gerlando, falls in love with Rozimunda and thereby becomes Gerlando's rival. Faramundo offers himself as a sacrifice to the shades of the heroine's brother. She rejects his offer. In like manner, La Calprenède portrays Faramond as the ally of Gondioch in the campaign against the Cimbrians. After reaching the capital of the invaded nation, the leader of the Franks falls in love with Rosemonde, the object of Gondioch's affections. Neither author troubles to invent a name for the city where the enamourment takes place. The Portuguese dramatist changes the name of the rival. A more essential difference lies in the fact that Faramundo has killed only the brother of Rozimunda, whereas Faramond is indirectly responsible for the death of her father as well. Gustavo, the father, is alive throughout the play and contributes to many of the important scenes. After establishing the triangle and the accompanying complications, the dramatist develops the love story of Clotilde, sister of Faramundo, and Adolfo, brother of Rozimunda (I, 2). In the French version, Viridomare, whose brother was killed by Faramond, falls in love with Polixene, sister of Faramond. The dramatist has achieved a greater unity by making the suitor of Faramundo's sister the brother of the slain Esveno. This unification and the changing of the names are the only departures from the original scheme of the novel.³ The scene in which Gustavo denounces his son for his unfaithfulness is found in the novel.⁴ Ataulphe is a comparatively unimportant figure in La Calprenède's story, whereas Adolfo is heir to the Cimbrian throne and the suitor of Faramundo's sister in the play.⁵ As in the novel, the heroine is offered by her father as a prize to the man who brings in the head of Faramond. Torn between love and filial duty, she is re-

² Since the influence of the *Cid* on *Faramond* has already been discussed, it is necessary to indicate only those similarities which exist between the novel and the later play. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 63-66.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁴ I, 4, *Ibid.*, p. 85.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

luctant either to disobey her father or to renounce her love. Chismène or Rosemonde might well have offered the following lament

Entra a honra, e a piedade,
que a sua dor merece,
meu coração afflicto desfalece,
eu não posso vingar-me, nem
me atravo,
perdoar-lhe não devo
Que farei? Que rezolvo! ⁶

Faramundo confronts her in her own capital. She does as her French counterparts did before her and dismisses her hero with the exhortation to defend his life against her rivals and her father's hostility.

Teus reinos vai guardar, vai defender-te,
do odio de Gustavo, e dos furores
dos teus competidores (II, 4)

After establishing the villainy of Theobalde, captain of the Cimbrian guards in the play and the slain brother of Rosemonde in the novel, by revealing his plot to kidnap the heroine with the complicity of Gernando, her self-appointed champion, the solution to all difficulties is presented. In the novel, Briomer substitutes his own son for the Cimbrian *dauphin*. Thus, Faramond kills the son of Briomer. The blood-brother of Rosemonde is not the slain Theobalde but Balamir.⁷ In the play, Teobalde discloses that the slain Esveno was not the brother of Rozimunda but his own son. Childerico, cast as the *confidante* of Rozimunda, is her real brother. Teobalde had made the substitution many years previous when Gustavo was away at the wars (III, 3). The play, like the novel, closes on a happy note. The reconciliation in the stage version, however, is more complete, for Faramundo pardons Theobaldo and Gernando as the curtain drops.

SPIRE PITOU, JR.

College of Mount Saint Vincent

⁶ I, 3.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp 77-8.

LES LIMBES

The changes in title which Baudelaire's volume of poems underwent before its publication as *Les Fleurs du Mal* are well known. In 1846 *Les Lesbienues* is announced, "pour paraître prochainement." But in 1848 the *Echo des Marchands de vin* promises for publication in the following year "*Les Limbes*, poésies par Charles Baudelaire," and in 1850 and 1851 extracts "*des Limbes*" are published. There seems good reason to think that this would have been the definitive title, had it not been for the *contretemps* indicated by M. Crépet in his edition of the *Fleurs du Mal* the publication, announced in the *Bibliographie de la France* in May, 1852, of "*Les Limbes*, poésies intimes de Georges Durand, recueillies et publiées par son ami Th. Véron, in-8°." Baudelaire had of necessity to find another title for his volume, and, Asselineau tells us, discussed the question lengthily with his friends before deciding at last on Hyppolite Babou's suggestion, *Les Fleurs du Mal*.

Critics, sometimes severe for this final title, have given little regret, and less curiosity, to its ill-fated predecessor. M. Crépet says, for example. "[Le titre] *des Limbes*, bien qu'un peu exsangue, même si on lui attribue ici sa valeur dantesque, lui plaisait probablement et pour l'atmosphère religieuse qu'il évoque, et pour ce qu'il renferme d'énigmatique"¹ But the title is not, I believe, merely a vague allusion. Let us turn to Balzac's *Chef-d'œuvre inconnu*, published in 1831, and reprinted, with the addition of important passages on the theory of painting, in 1837. The close parallel between these passages and certain ideas of Delacroix has been pointed out,² and this parallel would hardly fail to attract the special notice of Baudelaire, an enthusiastic reader of Balzac. In the *Chef-d'œuvre inconnu* the old painter, Frenhofer, pronounces these words "Oh! pour voir un moment, une seule fois, la nature divine, complète, l'idéal enfin, je donnerais toute ma fortune, mais j'irais te chercher dans tes limbes, beauté céleste! Comme Orphée, je descendrais dans l'enfer de l'art pour en ramener la vie"³ Here are Baudelaire's *Limbes*. Not merely the word—that he

¹ *Les Fleurs du Mal, Les Epaves*, Paris, Conard, 1922, pp 301-302

² See Fosca, F, "Les artistes dans les romans de Balzac," *Revue critique*, mars 1922.

³ Bouteron et Longnon, *Œuvres complètes de Honoré de Balzac*, Paris, Conard, xxviii (1925), 20

might have found in a hundred places—but the *motif* of the volume, indicated, less happily perhaps, by the definitive *Fleurs du Mal*.

The Balzac passage is at most a point of departure; it is far from the tragic intensity of the *Hymne à la Beauté*, with its "Que tu viennes du ciel ou de l'enfer, qu'importe, O Beauté!" Frenhofer's Beauty is, like Eurydice, a stranger in Hades; Baudelaire's is a familiar there. But Balzac's passage can hardly have failed to catch Baudelaire's attention, particularly if he read it when he was in search of a title. Had circumstances not obliged him to change his title, this passage might well have served as epigraph to *Les Limbes*.

Baudelaire's borrowings in his early years were numerous and his debt to Balzac, as has been pointed out more than once in recent years, is far from negligible. The mere addition of one more possible item to this account is in itself of no great significance; what does seem to me interesting is the evidence that *Les Limbes* was not a somewhat vague and conventional title, but one which expressed for Baudelaire, quite as clearly as the not too felicitous *Fleurs du Mal*, the essence of his poetry.

MARGARET GILMAN

Bryn Mawr College

THE COURTIER IN *HAMLET* AND *THE WILD DUCK*

In the fifth chapter of the fifth book of Goethe's *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, the hero is discussing with Serlo, the stage manager, their proposed production of *Hamlet*. Since the number of the members of the troupe is quite limited, the casting of the characters presents considerable difficulty. Serlo proposes that the rôles of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern be combined into one, because in this way it would be very simple to save one actor.¹ Goethe lets Wilhelm continue as follows:

¹ This had been done by the actor who served as Goethe's model for Serlo, Friedrich Ludwig Schroder (1744-1816), who is considered by many critics to have been Germany's greatest actor. He was the first to present *Hamlet* on the German stage (1776) and his performances aroused an enormous amount of interest. His version of *Hamlet* is reprinted in Alexander von Weilen, *Der erste deutsche Bühnen-Hamlet*, Wien, 1914.

Gott bewahre mich vor solchen Verkürzungen, die zugleich Sinn und Wirkung aufheben, versetzte Wilhelm Das, was diese beiden Menschen sind und tun, kann nicht durch einen vorgestellt werden In solchen Kleinigkeiten zeigt sich Shakespeares Grosse Dieses leise Auftreten, dieses Schmiegen und Biegen, dies Jasagen, Streicheln und Schmeicheln, diese Behendigkeit, dieses Schwanzeln, diese Allheit und Leerheit, diese rechtliche Schurkerei, diese Unfähigkeit, wie kann sie durch einen Menschen ausgedrückt werden? Es sollten hier wenigstens ein Dutzend sein, wenn man sie haben konnte, denn sie sind bloss in Gesellschaft etwas, sie sind die Gesellschaft, und Shakespeare war sehr bescheiden und weise, dass er nur zwei solche Repräsentanten auftreten liess Ueberdies brauche ich sie in meiner Bearbeitung als ein Paar, das mit dem einen, guten, trefflichen Horatio kontrastiert

When, in 1884, Ibsen published his *Wild Duck*, he had to provide similarly fawning courtiers. They are described as being comparable to the vintages of various years by Madame Soerby, as she takes a dig at them by saying, chamberlains too require a great deal of sun (of court favor) They flatter their hosts, they are, as the phrase has it, "yes-men", they are eager to fall in with every current convention, they laugh at their superiors' jokes, even those at their own expense, while toward their inferiors they show themselves to be mean souls. Whereas Ibsen in his social plays is extremely economical regarding the number of characters—*Ghosts* has five characters, *Rosmersholm* has six, *The Master Builder* has seven, *Hedda Gabler* has seven—for this rôle of courtier he selects nine characters, the reason he chose exactly this number was that he also wanted to have thirteen at table. The chamberlains are all very much alike, representing "Society," but three of them are individualized in the spirit of broad caricature The effect of the flabby gentleman, the bald gentleman, the short-sighted gentleman, and the six other chamberlains is to present an extremely forcible contrast to young Gregers Werle, the unbending, though misguided idealist.

It is well known that Ibsen was familiar with Goethe's works.² Naturally enough, like many other authors, Ibsen was loath to

² For Ibsen's reading and references to Goethe, cf Halvdan Koht, "Ibsen as a Norwegian," *The Nineteenth Century*, February, 1910, John Paulsen, *Erunnerungen an Henrik Ibsen*, Berlin, 1907, p. 66, Letter to Georg Brandes of February 11, 1895—not to mention the famous *Faust* quotation in the fourth act of *Peer Gynt* and other allusions

acknowledge any "influence" Whether or not he was aware of this passage, it is evident that he conforms to it, and as Goethe says, in such a minor point shows his greatness as a dramatist.

A. E. ZUCKER

The University of Maryland

ZU MORGENSTERNS "STEINOCHS"¹

Dieses Gedicht ist nicht ohne Kommentar verständlich. Es lautet

Der Steinochs schüttelt stumm sein Haupt,
dass jeder seine Kraft ihm glaubt
Er spießt dich plötzlich auf sein Horn
und bohrt von hinten dich bis vorn Weh!

Der Steinochs lebt von Berg zu Berg,
vor ihm wird, was da wandelt, Zwerg
Er nährt sich meist—und das ist neu—
von menschlicher Gehirne Heu Weh!

Der Steinochs ist kein Tier, das stirbt,
dieweil sein Fleisch niemals verdirbt
Denn wir sind Staub, doch er ist Stein!
Du mochtest wohl auch Steinochs sein? He?

Leo Spitzer² sucht nach Erklärungen für "Von Berg zu Berg," "menschlicher Gehirne Heu" und "kein Tier, das stirbt, . . . denn . . . er ist Stein," ohne dass er eine befriedigende Lösung findet. Obwohl hier sicher die Idee des Ewigen, von der Entwicklung Unberührten, mitspielt, so glaube ich doch, dass Morgenstern hier zunächst nicht eine philosophische Idee vorschwebte, sondern, dass er an einen ganz bestimmten Steinochs dachte, nämlich an den, der über dem Eingang zu den Fleischhallen in Nürnberg angebracht ist. Diese Figur, deren Horner unverhältnismässig gross und drohend sind, ist in der ersten Strophe ausgezeichnet beschrieben. "Von Berg zu Berg" wird dann eine harmlose Anspielung auf Nürnberg, und Spitzers² Vergleich mit Steinbock wird unnötig.

¹ Christian Morgenstern, *Alle Galgenlieder*, Verlag Bruno Cassirer, Berlin, 1932 Seite 49

² Sperber und Spitzer, *Motiv und Wort*, O. R. Reisland, Leipzig, 1918. Seite 70.

Für die weitere Erklärung müssen wir die beiden Hexameter betrachten, die unter der Figur stehen.

Omnia habent ortus suaque in crementa sed ecce
quem cernis nunquam bos fuit hic vitulus

Ich möchte sie folgendermassen übersetzen:

Alle tragen in sich Ursprung und Wachstum, ich aber,
den du als Ochsen hier siehst, niemals war ich ein Kalb

Damit ist die letzte Strophe ohne weiteres erklärt. Nun bleibt noch das "Heu der menschlichen Gehirne". Morgenstern durfte bemerkt haben, dass der Steinochs seine sehr grosse Popularität bei der Bevölkerung vielen mehr oder weniger geistvollen Anspielungen und Witzen verdankt, die in der Hauptsache auf den Hexametern beruhen (z. B. Welcher Ochse war nie ein Kalb? Der Ochse auf der Fleischbrücke!).

Vielleicht gibt diese zwanglose Erklärung auch für andere, ähnliche Gedichte Morgensterns einen Schlüssel.

PAUL FORCHHEIMER

New York

NEW FACTS REGARDING OWEN FELTHAM

Hitherto it has not been known just when Owen Feltham died—or where. Records of litigation concerning his estate disclose the fact that he died on February 23, 1667/8, at the London house of the Countess Dowager of Thomond in the Strand.¹ With a characteristic piety and modesty Feltham had specified in his will:

For my Body where it shall fall to Earth I am Content that in that Parish there the Trunke bee laid, the sooner after my Decease the better in the Church or any where, Where my Executor pleases, With as little Ceremony as Decently may bee When the Jewell is gone wee use not to be solicitous about the Case.²

¹ Public Record Office, C6/187/115, *Thomond vs Feltham and Vyner*, C5/480/41, *Feltham vs Hurt et al*. These documents, together with C5/480/42, *Feltham vs Thomond*, corroborate the belief that in the course of service as steward in the Thomond household Feltham became at least reasonably wealthy.

² P C C, 46 Hené. Perhaps it is worth while to note that Feltham's will was written in his own hand.

Feltham's wishes were fulfilled. The registers of St. Martin's in the Fields, the parish in which Feltham died, disclose the fact that he was buried there on February 24th.

The necessities of legal controversy are likely to preclude any generous or even just view of the persons involved. It is a striking fact, however, that in the documents concerning Feltham which have come to my attention he is spoken of invariably with high respect and even affection. The Countess Dowager of Thomond declares that she believes Feltham "was just and ffarthfull . . in all . . the affaires this defend^t intrusted him wth and shall still soe Continue her beleife till shee finds very good reason to the Contrary w^{ch} shee hopes shee never shall."³ Of a letter bearing on the settlement of the Thomond property at Great Billing, Feltham's nephew and namesake observes that "this Def^ts sayd deceased Unkle was reputed to be and this Defend^t doth beleieve he was a man of that Integrity that he would not haue giuen such a thinge under his hand unlesse it had been soe."⁴ In connection with a minor tangle growing out of the settlement of Feltham's own estate, John and Anne Ward testify that they "had & doth reteyne very good thoughts of and for the said owen feltham Decd"⁵ Still further evidence of the trust and esteem accorded to Feltham is revealed in the will of Barnaby, 6th Earl of Thomond.⁶ Among the "small guifts answareable to my present Condi^{ti}on which had beene greater accordinge to my affection had my losses and sufferinges in Ireland beene lesse," he gives "to Owen feltham ffiftye pounds yearleie and dureing his life or Twoe hundred and ffiftye pounds in money . . besides what Leases [he has] of mine in Ireland." Plainly, those who knew Feltham well echoed spontaneously the sentiments of Thomas Randolph:

Thy life had been
Pattern enough, had it of all been seen,
Without a book⁷

Feltham devoted the greater part of his life to the service of the O'Briens. In 1669, Henry, 7th Earl of Thomond, declared that Feltham had been "about forty yeares attendant in y^e family."⁸

³ C5/480/42

⁵ C5/480/41.

⁴ C6/184/117, Thomond *vs* Feltham.

⁶ P C C, 181 Wootton.

⁷ "To Master Feltham, on his book of Resolves," *Poetical and Dramatic Works*, ed W C Hazlitt (London, 1875), II, 574.

⁸ C6/40/98, Thomond *vs* Thomond *et al*

It would seem that he assumed his position with the O'Briens about the time of his father's death in March, 1632.⁹ In any case it is plain that, since he was born, probably, in 1602, virtually his entire maturity was spent with the O'Briens. Such an extended period of loyal stewardship goes far toward explaining the pronouncedly Royalist strain in his writings.

FRED S. TUPPER

The George Washington University

CHAPMAN'S FORTUNE WITH WINGED HANDS: SUPPLEMENTARY

In *Modern Language Notes* for March, 1937, pp. 190-2, appeared a note on *Chapman's Fortune with Winged Hands*. To the passages there quoted may be added the following from the *Alexandreis* of Gualterus de Castellione (Walter of Châtillon):

Vestri [or nostri] fortunam pedibus dixere carentem
Pennatasque manus et habentem brachia pingunt.
Ergo manus si forte tibi porrexerit, alas
Corripe, ne rapidis, quando volet, avolet alis

(Book 8, Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 209, 549D-550A, Paris, 1855)

The belief that wing-feathers grew on the hands and arms of the Scythian Fortune is, then, as old as the twelfth century.¹

Duke University

ALLAN H. GILBERT

⁹ The date is usually given as 1631, but his son Robert carefully specifies March—i e, March 1631/32 (C2 Charles I, F10/41, Feltham vs Feltham). Feltham's father and paternal grandfather, both named Thomas, were prosperous small landowners of Suffolk (P C C, 64 Audley; P C C, 24 Sainberbe, C2 James I, F4/47, Feltham vs Codd et al). Feltham's brother Robert was an attorney of the Court of Chancery and in later years a resident of Sculthorpe, Norfolk (C2 Charles I, F5/10, Feltham vs Joslyn, *ibid*, F34/49, Feltham vs Peck et al., C10/484/69, Feltham vs Bright et al.). Apparently Feltham's second brother, Thomas, was a wealthy vintner of Norwich (C10/51/64, Feltham vs Elliott et al., C8/153/24, Coupledick vs Feltham et al., C2 Charles I, F10/41).

¹ For the popularity and influence of the *Alexandreis* see Francis P. Magoun, *The Gestis of King Alexander of Macedon*, Cambridge, 1929, p. 22, Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* 3 922 ff.

REVIEWS

Walt Whitman as a Critic of Literature. By MAURICE O JOHNSON University of Nebraska Studies in Language, Literature and Criticism, no. 16. Lincoln. University of Nebraska, 1938 Pp 73.

Emerson's Use of the Bible. By HARRIET RODGERS ZINK University of Nebraska Studies in Language, Literature, and Criticism, no 14 Lincoln University of Nebraska, 1935. Pp. 75.

The Beginnings of the Professional Theatre in Texas By EDWARD G FLETCHER University of Texas Bulletin, no. 3621. Austin University of Texas, 1936. Pp. 55.

Chinese Themes in American Verse By WILLIAM ROBERT NORTH. Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania, 1937 Pp 175.

Scandinavian Themes in American Fiction. By GEORGE LEROY WHITE, JR. Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania, 1937. Pp. 231.

The Spirit of America as Interpreted in the Works of Charles Sealsfield. By WILLIAM PAUL DALLMANN St. Louis · Washington University, 1935. Pp. 125.

Herman Melvilles Gedankengut Eine Kritische Untersuchung seiner weltanschaulichen Grundideen Von K. H. SUNDERMANN. Berlin Arthur Collignon, 1937 Pp. 226 RM. 6

The first two works on the present list are master's essays of unusual competence, directed by Professor Louise Pound Mr. Johnson's study of Whitman as a critic begins with selections from the poet's more trenchant observations on a variety of authors and then concentrates on his reactions to Shakespeare, Tennyson, Scott, Dickens, Carlyle, Burns, Emerson, Longfellow, Bryant, and Whittier. The conclusion is that Whitman looked for democratic purpose in literature as well as artistic excellence Miss Zink's essay on Emerson's use of the Bible gathers together almost all of the available material on its subject and offers in Chapter IV an interesting study of Emerson's technique of paraphrasing The whole work is the first extensive treatment of the subject and is, accordingly, of more value to the specialist than good masters' essays are apt to be.

Professor Fletcher has given in his little pamphlet an account of the first theatrical performances in English within the boundaries of Texas. The first play was performed in the village of Houston in June, 1838, by actors who had previously been playing in Mobile or New Orleans. The picture of histrionic attempts up to 1841 is pieced in from incomplete data, but is drawn by an experienced hand. A couple of playbills, a few newspaper notices, a list of people connected with the companies in Houston, a partial list of plays presented, and a few specimens of verse inspired by the Texas Thespians are included as appendices. The whole is a splendid example of antiquarian labor—the kind of study which is vitally necessary if broader surveys of cultural interests in the States are ever to be properly written.

Chinese Themes in American Verse is a glaring example of a doctoral dissertation without sufficient material to carry its author beyond collecting details which remain merely details. "Commerce, Shipping, and Commodities" occupy ten pages, while "Chinese Thought, Literature, and Religion," all grouped together, run to seventeen all told. The author is, quite properly, interested in the development of realism as the nineteenth century progressed, but his observations on even such an important topic are distressingly unconvincing. If the study had been extended beyond 1900 perhaps the more abundant material would have spared Dr. North the pains of noting that in American verse "Such Chinese varieties as Souchong, Imperial, and gunpowder are mentioned in addition to those already named."

Dr. White's opus on Scandinavian themes in our fiction has profited by Professor A. H. Quinn's extensive knowledge of American novels. His researches, however, have turned up no neglected masterpieces, and the study concentrates, so far as there is any concentration, on the writings of Ottalie A. Lallencrantz, O. E. Rolvaag, Hjalmar H. Boyesen, Willa Cather, and Martha Ostenso. The method of the study shifts from time to time, and the manner of treatment of even the more significant figures varies considerably. A number of minor works, especially of the twentieth century, are analyzed from the point of view of plot, but no essentially important conclusions are drawn from the perusal of a wide assortment of stories and novels which bear upon the topics "The Scandinavian Settlement," "The Individual Scandinavian," and "The Scandinavian and the Foreign Scene." Perhaps the chief value in the dissertation other than the outline of American interest in the Scandinavian lies in its presentation of the literary career of Boyesen.

Dr. Dallmann's purpose in adding his doctoral researches to the studies of Sealsfield already existing was to ferret out from the novels, travel books and letters of the German-American fiction-writer whatever opinions were expressed about the United States,

its institutions, or its characteristics. Passing from a consideration of Sealsfield's opinions concerning freedom in America, he goes on to popular sovereignty, the problems presented by the Indians, the Negroes and the Unitarians, the lack of intellectual or cultural interest on the part of the inhabitants, and other such aspects of American civilization as impressed the novelist in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Since Sealsfield was comparatively a realist this job of rounding up his observations and opinions is of considerable value to the social historian. Occasionally the reports of other observers, like Mrs Trollope and Francis Lieber, are included by way of comparison, and frequently the opinions of present-day historians are used to substantiate the validity of Sealsfield's remarks. No especial critical insight upon Dr Dallmann's part is evident, and the weakest portion of his work, as a result, is a brief chapter on the literary and historical significance of Sealsfield, but the study in general is a good apprentice opus—direct, clear, and well-arranged.

Of the several works included in the present review by far the most important to the student of American letters is Dr. K. H. Sundermann's treatise on Melville's ideas. The author of *Moby-Dick* wished to be remembered as a more important person than "a man who lived among the cannibals." Indeed, his passion for metaphysical discussion may be said to have wrecked his career as a novelist. As a consequence the study of his ideas is of much greater significance than might ordinarily seem to be the case with a novelist of the Romantic school. But the difficulties of extricating from the speeches of characters the true sentiments of their creator are tremendous. Moreover, Dr. Sundermann does not spare himself in ranging the whole gamut of Melville's opinions, from literary theory, political philosophy, and social ethics, to metaphysics and religion.

By all odds the most important part of this work is the discussion of Melville's religion, which is well considered and complete. As a result of Dr. Sundermann's recognition of the central place of religious views in the novelist's store of ideas he gives us for the first time in print a complete analysis of *Clarel*, a work which with *Mardi* and *Moby-Dick* appears to be the chief pabulum for the investigation of Melville's ideas. The section on the philosophical elements is of less consequence largely because Melville was no philosopher, but, if the details are disappointing, and very occasionally inaccurate, the conclusions drawn from them are wise and illuminating. Perhaps Melville's equipment as a critical, political, or economic theorist was even less than his endowment as a philosopher, and so the analysis of the statements in his novels in these fields is perforce even less satisfying. A special section on Melville and German philosophy, which might be considered to have weight because of Dr. Sundermann's background, is again pro-

ductive of a barren yield. Melville really had little acquaintance with the Germans.

Other than the limitations natural to any attempt to extract philosophy from fiction—even philosophical fiction—the chief weakness of this study is its dependence upon the frail foundations of Melville scholarship erected by Raymond Weaver and especially Lewis Mumford. Dr. Sundermann avoids the pseudo-Freudian interpretations of these two biographers but has not altogether escaped their proneness to consider Melville's novels primarily as autobiography. Nevertheless, this is a very valuable work—the most scholarly volume on Melville now in print.

CLARENCE GOHDES

Duke University

The Tragedy of Hamlet a Critical Edition of the Second Quarto, 1604. By THOMAS MARC PARROTT and HARDIN CRAIG. Princeton University Press, 1938. Pp. x + 250. \$3.50.

To offer "the intelligent reader a better idea of what Shakespeare wrote than the badly printed Q 2 with its errors, misunderstandings, and omissions" is the avowed purpose of Professor Parrott and Professor Craig in this "critical edition of the genuine text." Believing, with ample justification, that "Q 2 better than any other version represents *Hamlet* as Shakespeare finally wrote it," but, like Professor Dover Wilson and others, blaming its occasional aesthetic inferiority on the much-maligned compositor, and, to a certain extent, on Shakespeare's "none of the best" handwriting, the editors have given us a text not so eclectic as that of Dr. Wilson, but one none the less open to some of the same charges of inconsistency as the New Cambridge *Hamlet*. Such charges are, however, easy to level, and as easy to demonstrate, precisely where to draw the line between aesthetic preference (which can sometimes be very ingeniously justified on bibliographical grounds) and what the text says is one of the greatest difficulties of editorship. It is obvious that the present editors have given the matter much more careful consideration than did Dr. Wilson, an adept at the art of eating cake and having it, whose stimulating and provocative edition, avowedly based on Q 2, is about as eclectic as an edition well can be.

It is one of the mysteries of Shakespearean scholarship that, though Q 2 of *Hamlet* is now pretty generally agreed to be the text closest to Shakespeare, the "true and perfect Coppie," no one seems really to like it well enough to stick to it when a favorite emendation will make better sense out of what is already good sense,

e. g., the emendation of *browes* to *braues* (Wilson emends on equally sound bibliographical grounds to *brawls*) in III, iii, 7:

Hazerd so neer's as doth houely grow
Out of his browes,

a reading which Parrott and Craig, as well as Wilson, consider nonsensical. *Nonsensical* is, however, too strong a word, inasmuch as Shakespeare is full of references to threatening brows (*vide* Schmidt's *Lexicon*, cf. also *Hamlet*, I, ii, 3-4 "our whole Kingdome/ To be contracted in one browe of woe"). The Q 2 line may well be metonymy, implying menacing, lowering, scowling aspect.

A few more examples will suffice to illustrate some of the dangers which must inevitably beset any endeavor to get back of the compositor and corrector to the copy. In I, ii, 105, Q 2 has the not unprecedented spelling *course* (for the more usual *corse*). The present editors, though perfectly aware that the same spelling appears in the third quarto of *Richard III* (I, ii, 33), alongside *corse* and *coarse*, believe that the Q 2 spelling in *Hamlet* shows the *u* for a misprint, and print F *coarse*.

Q 2 *wary* in I, ii, 133 is likewise regarded as a printer's error, though a perfectly good phonological explanation of this spelling for *weary* is possible. Indeed, there is very good reason to believe, on the basis of many comparatively unusual though astonishingly apt spellings, that Shakespeare was very frequently phonetic and, to a somewhat lesser extent, analogical in his spelling, and I believe that the Q 2 compositor (on p. 46 of the volume under review he is, "though conscientious," "unskilled, ignorant, and working under pressure", on p. 48 he is a "not unintelligent worker") has, through his very inexperience—luckily for us—set up a great many of these phonetic and analogical spellings precisely as he saw them in his copy—that is to say, dolt as he very probably was, he has given some of us a closer, more intimate view of Shakespeare by reason of his slavishness in following his copy than we might otherwise have.

The Q 2 and F. line "Breathing like sanctified and pious bonds" (I, iii, 130) has been accepted by Wilson, who asks, referring to Theobald's emendation, "What is a pious bawd?" The present editors answer this question quite satisfactorily, if it need an answer, and accept the Theobald emendation, at the same time rejecting a reading of the two best texts which makes perfectly good sense—though not so neat, of course, as the emendation which they accept. Likewise, in III, iv, 162 ("Of habits deuill") the editors, this time following Wilson, accept another Theobald emendation ("Of habits euill"), though the comparatively unemancipated editors of the *Globe* were content to follow Q. 2.

It is difficult to agree that Qq. *cost* in the line "And with such

daily cost of brazon Cannon" (I, I, 73) is "probably a misprint for *cast*" The reading of the two earliest texts makes good sense if we take the word to mean "expense", also, the word may well be a variant spelling of *cast*, reflecting, not a compositor's o/a error, but an Elizabethan confusion between the sounds designated by those letters reflecting itself in Shakespeare's spelling In any case it would seem that, with both early texts in agreement, an edition of Q 2 should print *cost*, with the aesthetic preference for *cast* relegated to a footnote

Professor Parrott and Professor Craig have, however, performed a real service in bringing their editorial experience and great familiarity with Elizabethan idiom to the task of preparing a critical edition of this most fascinating of plays They have, unlike their most recent predecessor, admitted to their text comparatively few of the aesthetic preferences which make the New Cambridge *Hamlet* so largely a reflection of its editor's literary tastes.

The University of Maryland

THOMAS PYLES

The Mirror for Magistrates. Edited from Original Texts by LILY B. CAMPBELL Cambridge, England University Press, New York Macmillan, 1938. Pp. vii + 554. \$12.

The title of Professor Campbell's book leads one to expect a reprint based upon *all* the sixteenth-century editions of the *Mirror for Magistrates*. Haslewood in 1815 issued such a reprint, though not very accurately, and his work, based upon the edition of 1587, contains some eighty-six tragedies, while for good measure he also includes Niccols' 1609-1610 edition, thus bringing the total up to ninety-six tragedies, plus inductions, prose links, and so on. Miss Campbell, who knows more about the *Mirror* than any other living scholar, unquestionably had good reasons (one reason must have been the enormous expense of printing) for confining her reprint to what she calls "the original *Mirror*." But it is not unlikely that users of her book unfamiliar with Haslewood or the Elizabethan editions will get the impression that her thirty-three tragedies represent everything contained in the various Elizabethan *Mirrors*.

One could wish that she had stated her editorial aims more clearly. What she says is, "Since the publication of the *Mirror* was progressive and cumulative, it was decided to use as basic texts for this edition the first extant printed text of every part of the work, and to collate later editions of these parts with the original texts" (p. 4), and "The earliest printed text of each part of the *Mirror* has been reprinted and later texts collated with this earliest surviving text" (p. 58). These statements, like the title, may

easily make readers believe that they have before them a complete reprint of all the tragedies in all the sixteenth-century editions. Without clearly defining "the original *Mirror*" she omits the tragedies in the editions of John Higgins (1574, 1575), Thomas Blenerhasset (1578), and Richard Niccols (1609-1610). Of course there is some reason for excluding Blenerhasset, every reason for omitting Niccols, but Higgins' tragedies were reprinted in the 1587 *Mirror*, and here are ignored, despite the statement (p. 4) that "additions to the original *Mirror* [of 1559], made in 1563, in 1578, and in 1587" are reprinted. Furthermore, the Introduction gives sketchy and inadequate details about the contents and authorship of the omitted editions, which are not even mentioned in the Appendix describing "the Huntington Library Copies of the Texts." There is nothing sacred about "the original *Mirror*", the imitative continuations of Higgins, Blenerhasset, and even Niccols have about as much interest for students as have any original of 1559, 1563, 1578, or 1587, and they furnish striking proof of the popularity and influence of "the original *Mirror*". However cogent the reasons for this abbreviated editing, the fact remains that it does not supersede, as it should have done, Haslewood's century-old book or W. F. Trench's 1898 study. Students must continue to go to them for texts and important information that Miss Campbell has had to omit.

Perhaps it was too much to hope that any editor or publisher could afford the time and money necessary for an up-to-date Haslewood. Dismissing vain—and seemingly impertinent—comments on what Miss Campbell has not done, one cannot be too grateful for her work. To be sure, there are a few slips (like the three trifling errors in the footnotes on the very first page of the Introduction), while in the texts and collations needless brackets for line numbers injure the looks of otherwise beautiful pages. Then, too, her insistence that the *Mirror* is "practically unknown and unread" is exaggerated, as is proved by her own abundant references to books and articles dealing with the *Mirror*, as well as by special studies (like the theses of Hugo Zimmermann, James Davies, Georg Kartzke, Hanna Steiner) that she had no occasion to mention. But only an ungenerous, crabbed reviewer could fail to recognize the new and valuable material which the excessively modest Introduction sets forth or could deny praise to the meticulous accuracy with which the texts of the tragedies and the variant readings are reproduced. Editing such texts is a tiresome and arduous job. Miss Campbell herself should undertake the further work on the problems of the *Mirror* that her Introduction calls desirable. She deserves the credit for it—and the fun.

HYDER E. ROLLINS

Harvard University

Cavalier Drama, an Historical and Critical Supplement to the Study of the Elizabethan and Restoration Stage By ALFRED HARBAGE. New York Modern Language Association of America, 1936 Pp x + 302 \$2.50.

Mr Harbage believes that one can establish a species of Cavalier plays, separate and distinct from the ordinary post-Fletcherian drama. This *genre* is defined as a "schematic dramatization of the action of Greek romance, peopled by Platonics who deliver themselves of undramatic essays, written in a florid cadenced prose, feministic in tendency, grave and refined in tone. . . We may call the type a heroical but *précieuse* tragicomedy of *anagnorisis*." (P 41.)

These Cavalier plays are not unlike the work of Fletcher and his followers, but distinctions may be drawn between the two groups. Fletcher and his professional successors are neither precious nor feminist. In the amateur efforts of the Cavalier, precious characteristics are present to a marked degree; upon occasion the action comes to a full stop while the characters discuss fine feelings. Women assume a greater importance. They become the center of interest, about which the action revolves. Even the titles reflect the change—*Aglaura, Claricilla, Rosania*. This feminism explains their almost uniform freedom from ribaldry and coarseness. Under Queen Henrietta's leadership the court was being refined, and the court plays reflect the trend. The Cavalier hero, unlike the "lily-livered" heroes of Fletcher, takes on the stature which accompanies heroic valor. The heroine is virtuous first, a woman second. Only in the common use of romantic-type plot material and in the irregularity of the blank verse do the two schools of writers resemble each other, and the blank verse of a Fletcher or a Shirley differs greatly from the rhythmic language of a Carlell or a Suckling. Mr Harbage seems correct in his contention. Indeed, he might well have gone further. These Cavalier dramas are not only of a different *genre*, they were written from a new, although as yet unannounced aesthetic point of view. Fletcher and his followers wrote with the old end in mind. A tragedy appealed to deep emotions of grief, of horror, of pity. Even in the "decadence" of Jacobean drama this holds true. These plays of the courtiers had a different purpose; the audience came to admire, in the old sense of the word. A later generation was to expound the doctrine of admiration, but the Cavalier audience, no less than that of the sixties and seventies, was prepared to marvel at the bravery of the hero and to wonder at the virtuous sentiments of the heroine.

It follows that Mr. Harbage is not one of those who minimize the importance of the native tradition in favor of continental influence in the development of the heroic tragedy of the Restoration. His analysis of the pre-Restoration drama indicates that the

major characteristics of the later plays were present in the work of the mid-century Cavaliers. The same story materials were employed by the writers of both generations. "There is not a theme, in fact scarcely an incident, in the heroic plays which had not been utilized in the drama of the three preceding decades, not once but many times" (P 52). Upon occasion, the Restoration authors borrowed directly from their English predecessors. The heroic ideals of virtue and valor were not new to the later dramatists, "the *Preface to Gondibert* is as easily traceable to native English theory as to that of the continent" (P 55). Enough passages are quoted to prove that the typical rant of the heroic play is to be found in the Caroline ancestor. Heroic love was no innovation, for the love encounters of Carlell and Cartwright are those of Orrery and Dryden minus rime. Rime itself was used before *The Siege of Rhodes*, Quarles, Fane, Suckling, and others fell into rime occasionally, and George Cartwright's *Heroic Lover* (printed in 1661, although written earlier) is in couplets throughout. Nowhere except in the observance of the unities, when they were observed, were the Restoration writers indebted chiefly to the French. Mr. Harbage concludes that there can be no question of the continuity of seventeenth-century dramatic tradition. Restoration plays "are more *like* the Cavalier plays than they are like those of any period in any other nation, they are essentially a home grown product" (P 69).

Part two of Mr. Harbage's book is a survey of the drama from Walter Montague's *Shepherd's Paradise* of 1632-33 to the plays of Orrery and the Howards. Detailed analyses of most of the plays of the time are included, these are intended to be a substitute for reading, because so many of the plays are not available. The section is necessarily encyclopedic, and seems complete. A valuable play list is appended to the volume, giving the date of composition or production, date of printing, and authorship of all plays, masques, and pageants of the period. The notes, which provide a running bibliography, are collected at the end of each chapter, as always, this causes some inconvenience to the reader. There is an index.

FLETCHER HENDERSON

Madison, Wisconsin

David Garrick, Dramatist. By ELIZABETH P. STEIN. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1938. (Revolving Fund Series, VII) Pp. xx + 315. \$2 50.

In this critical study of the plays of David Garrick, the author sets out to establish three points. "(1) the merit of these pieces,

(2) the dramatist's contribution to the dramatic literature of the period, (3) and his own position in the history of the drama." In so doing she has examined twenty-one of Garrick's plays, describing them in detail and commenting upon interesting or unusual circumstances of their composition, presentation, and reception. Extensive use has been made of the valuable *MS. Diaries of the Drury Lane Theatre* (in the Folger Shakespeare Library), the records kept by the prompters, most interesting and most full after William Hopkins became prompter about 1760. Miss Stein finds great merit in many of Garrick's little comedies and superlative merit in *The Clandestine Marriage*. Her examination of the plays leads her to place Garrick in the classic tradition of English comedy, she finds that he strove to keep alive the genuine comic spirit of Shakespeare and of the Restoration playwrights in opposition to the prevailing sentimentality of his contemporaries. One might differ with her on individual points or object to her appraisal of particular pieces, but in general her evidence supports her contention that Garrick's plays are not negligible trifles. On the third point, Garrick's position in the history of drama, it is concluded that "After Sheridan and Goldsmith, . . . the third important dramatist of the period is David Garrick."

As Garrick's title to this position depends largely upon the extent of his responsibility for the excellencies of *The Clandestine Marriage*, Miss Stein has reviewed the external evidence of authorship and reinterpreted it in the light of a careful examination of the play in comparison with the other works of Colman and Garrick. Her meticulous study leads to the conclusion that this splendid comedy is "predominately Garrick's play." On the whole, the notable resemblances in situations, characters, and dialogue of *The Clandestine Marriage* to Garrick's acknowledged works convince one that the case is fairly well proved.

But it is not on this comedy alone that Garrick's position is assigned, and in attempting to arouse an interest in Garrick's other pieces equal to her own, the author is not altogether successful. About most of the other plays, little can be said, so the discussion becomes detailed abstracts of plots and ingenious pointing of resemblances to possible sources of inspiration. Garrick knew many plays, English and French, and he used them freely to concoct his own. His genius was, as Miss Stein says, "eclectic." "He had," she remarks, "an uncanny sense for detecting situations which would make good theatre, and with the skill of a master craftsman, he welded these together into extremely diverting and effective plays." That is to say, Garrick's works are in general adaptations. If this is so, there are many plays that might be considered Garrick's as justly as the twenty-one selected for this discussion. It is, perhaps, impossible to establish the corpus of Garrick's revisions and alterations. But what about Kelly's

False Delicacy? If it is true that Garrick contributed to that play the characters of Cecil and Mrs. Harley, he must have re-written Kelly's original, for as the play now stands, if it lacked these two characters it would be almost without beginning and entirely without end. Subjected to the sort of analysis that Miss Stein has given to *The Clandestine Marriage* it might yield results almost as interesting. Furthermore, why is *The Institution of the Garter* not taken up with the other spectacular pieces, such as *Cymon* and *The Jubilee*? It represents the same technique; and, though adapted from Gilbert West (as was *Cymon* from Dryden), it is as much Garrick's as are the translations from the French. And is it quite fair to ignore the adapted tragedies? Though all will agree that Garrick's talent in writing as in acting was greater in comedy, he did adapt (or restore) *Romeo and Juliet*, revising Otway's, not Shakespeare's, last act, and he altered *Cymbeline* and *Hamlet* and Southerne's *The Fatal Marriage*. To neglect these adaptations is, perhaps, to give only one side of the picture.

Miss Stein's book suffers from careless editing. In the first paragraph of Chapter I, it is stated that by acting surreptitiously at the beginning of his career Garrick ran the risk of being fined fifty pounds under the Licensing Act of 1737. This act forbade the performing of any *new* play that had not been licensed, Garrick was acting in an *old* play,—in an illegitimate theatre, it is true, but one that was evading the prohibition by giving an ostensibly free exhibition between the parts of a "concert" of music. On the same page (p 3) it is stated, "But no law prohibiting such plays [as the *The Historical Register* and *The Beggar's Opera*] was definitely put into operation until Fielding's defamatory farces had forced the enactment of such a decree." The point is not at all essential to Miss Stein's study, but this statement is slightly misleading. It has been well known that the Lord Chamberlain had long exercised the power to halt performance of objectionable pieces, and he had prevented the appearance of Gay's *Polly* only ten years or so before Garrick's debut.¹ On page 7 the Duke of Grafton is called "Lord Grafton," and on page 11 (and in the index) Henry Bate is called "Bates." On the point of the casting of *Lethe* (p 34) it might be worth while to note that the Drury Lane playbills do not show that Garrick ever acted the Drunken Man, though Stephen Jones does list him among the characters acted by Garrick. In the season 1748-

¹ See, for example, Arthur F. White, "The Office of Revels and Dramatic Censorship During the Restoration Period," *Western Reserve University Bulletin*, n s xxxiv, no 13 (Sept 15, 1931), pp 5-45. Two other studies of related matters have appeared since Miss Stein's book went to press. They are Alfred Jackson, "The Stage and the Authorities, 1700-1714," *RES*, xiv (1938), 53-62, and F. J. Crean, "The Stage Licensing Act of 1737," *MP*, xxxv (1938), 239-255.

1749 Garrick played the Poet and the Frenchman; Yates played the Drunken Man. Moreover, Garrick's parts were taken by various members of the company, and Garrick himself seldom appeared in the piece between 1750 and 1756, when Lord Chalkstone was added to the *dramatis personae*. In comparing *The Male Coquette* to *The Provok'd Wife* (p. 52), the reference to Sir John Brute in woman's clothes shows that the version used is not Vanbrugh's original but the revision of 1725. Concerning the reception of *Neck or Nothing*, Genest's statement that it "was abandoned after seven or eight performances" (p. 95) is allowed to stand. Actually, the piece was performed eleven times in the season 1766-1767 and seven times in 1773-1774. The reasons given on page 133 are not sufficient to prove the contention that the Huntington Library manuscript of *The Jubilee* was the Drury Lane copy. It is just as likely that it was the Licensor's copy, got somehow by Kemble from Larpent. But to argue the point would take more space than is available here. On page 155 is the assumption that on the retirement of Weston, Parsons "probably" acted the part of Dozey in *May Day*. It could have been discovered from the playbills that the part was acted by Waldron, if it was worth while to mention the fact at all. Reference to playbills or to advertisements in newspapers, instead of entire reliance on the prompter's diaries and Genest, would have prevented also the futile speculations about conditions surrounding the delivery of the interlude-entertainment *Linco's Travels* (pp. 165-166).

Slight though they are individually, these and other errors and inadequacies detract from the value of the work. Though few books get to the public without flaws, in this case the services of an informed copy-reader would have saved the author and the publishers some embarrassment.

DOUGALD MACMILLAN

The University of North Carolina

The Philosophy of Rhetoric. By I. A. RICHARDS. New York
Oxford University Press Pp. 138. \$1.75.

Mr. Richards has long concerned himself with the meaning of meaning, and particularly with the implications of his studies for criticism and literary interpretation. This present volume, the Mary Flexner Lectures, delivered at Bryn Mawr in 1936, is concerned with rhetoric, the new rhetoric, which, he declares, "should be a study of misunderstanding and its remedies". His interest is thus both theoretic and practical. With the older rhetoric he has little sympathy, regarding it as primarily a body of prudential rules for the furtherance of effective dispute. The older rhetoric,

furthermore, is interested in large-scale disposals of meaning rather than in a more minute investigation of the structure of the meanings with which discourse is composed. Richards is interested in the question: how do words work in discourse? The true results of the inquiry are to be tested pragmatically.

To forestall the suggestion that failure in communication may result from confusion of ideas, he declares his belief in the central importance of words both for concepts and experience.

Indeed, an idea or a notion, like the physicist's ultimate particles and rays, is only known by what it does. Apart from its dress or other signs it is not identifiable. (P. 5)

Words are the meeting points at which regions of experience which can never combine in sensation or intuition, come together. (P. 131)

One of the principal objects of attack is "the proper meaning superstition." Only in scientific language where concepts and definable universals are the subjects, do meanings achieve any degree of stability; in other forms of discourse, most of all in poetry, the meanings of words are functions of their contexts, being variable and multiple. In his endeavor to emphasize the fluidity of meaning, Richards, if he is correct, makes one cease to wonder at loss in communication, one doubts its possibility at all. For if the meaning of a word is in every instance determined by a particular context, and if each previous context was similarly unique, how is communication, certainly dependent in some measure upon recurrent significations, achievable? Is not connotation possible only where there is denotation?

But successful communication, he contends, is not to be achieved by reducing all discourse to the stable, "neutral," character of scientific language; that is neither possible nor desirable. The inevitable shifts of meaning in all interesting discussion are the source of power in language.

The remedy is not to resist these shifts but to learn to follow them. They recur in the same forms with different words, they have similar plans and common patterns, which experience enables us to observe and obey in practice—sometimes with a skilful ease which seems amazing when we examine it. Even now, if we could take *systematic* cognizance of even a small part of the shifts we fleetingly observe, the effect would be like that of introducing the multiplication table to calculators who just happened to know the working of a few sums and no others. And with such a clarification, such a translation of our skills into comprehension, a new era of human understanding and co-operation in thinking would be at hand. (P. 73)

Unfortunately we are not enlightened as to the pattern of shifts by which desirable ambiguity becomes systematic clarity. The new era of understanding must wait. (Stuart Chase is hot on the trail.)

The philosophic basis of his theorem—"what a word means is the missing parts of the contexts from which it draws its dele-

gated efficacy"—is most difficult to follow, for whereas "context" has the usual meaning in the last four chapters, in Chapter Two he uses "context" in a special sense.

Now for the sense of 'context' Most generally it is a name for a whole cluster of events that recur together—including the required conditions as well as whatever we may pick out as cause or effect But the modes of causal recurrence on which meaning depends are peculiar through that delegated efficacy I have been talking about In these contexts one item—typically a word—takes over the duties of parts which can then be omitted from the recurrence There is thus an abridgement of the context only shown in the behavior of living things, and most extensively and drastically shown by man When this abridgement happens, what the sign or word—the item with these delegated powers—means is the missing parts of the context (P 34)

Nor does the literary context of this chapter, or of the whole book, make this clear. He is, apparently, applying to language study the philosophy of organism

The practical conclusions drawn are chiefly negative in character, errors for the critic and reader to avoid. The advice is sound, the illustrations of critical follies are excellent, the examples of rich connotative interpretations are brilliant The discussion of metaphor as a fundamental principle of language is particularly illuminating, giving us helpful terminology and a new realization of the subtle interanimation of the "tenor" and "vehicle" One is slightly troubled, however, to learn that "bread" may be metaphorical for "house" since "housel" may mean "little house." It is a pity he did not look up the etymology of *housel* in the *NED*.

The writer does raise intriguing questions, and gives us prudential admonitions which only the unwary will disregard.

CLIFFORD P. LYONS

The University of Florida

Irish and Norse Traditions about the Battle of Clontarf. By ALBERTUS JOHANNES GOEDHEER. Haarlem H. D. Tjeenk Willink & Zoon N. V. 1938. Pp. xiii, 124.

This dissertation takes up for scrutiny the difficult, but fascinating question of inter-relationship between the Irish and the Icelandic literature concerning the battle of Clontarf (1014). Both traditions have been studied before, to be sure, but not by specialists thoroughly acquainted with both literatures

G begins by a study of the Irish tradition, whose chief exponent is *Cogadh Gaedhel re Gallarbh*, "The War of the Irish with the Foreigners," a (semi-)historical work from the first half of the 12th century G. discusses its MSS and its place in Irish literary history, showing that it was a popular work, which influenced more

or less all later treatments of the matter, whether in verse or prose. Of these derivative works G. gives one 18th century poem, printed here for the first time (with English translation). By comparison with older Irish annals, especially the *Ulster Annals*, contemporary with the events of Brian's life, G. shows that the *Cogadh* is partly based on annalistic records, partly on oral tradition, parallels to which can be found not only in the Icelandic records, but also in English sources (Beda, Asser's *Life of Alfred*, and *Gesta Herwardi*). In view of the fact that King Brian's sufferings during his guerilla warfare against the Norsemen are described in much the same fashion as Alfred's troubles under the similar circumstances of an earlier day, one feels tempted to ask, whether the story of the patriotic Alfred, in literary or oral form, might not have given the author of the *Cogadh* his fundamental point of view of Brian as the defender of the Irish against the Norsemen. But though G. often refers to the "political point of view" of the *Cogadh*, as obscuring actual history, he never attempts to explain its causes.

G. polemizes against modern writers of Irish history who, presumably led astray by the patriotic attitude of the *Cogadh* as well as through misinterpretations of the Icelandic texts, have regarded the Battle of Clontarf either as a decisive blow to the Norse invaders, or to Paganism. The status of the Norsemen in Ireland, G. argues, was definitely not affected by it, they fought on both sides. In reality the battle was one of many fought by Irish kings aspiring to the overlordship of the whole island. By tradition the title of high-king belonged to the Kings of Tara, but their actual power was not always commensurate with their claim. King Brian was *de facto* lord of Ireland, but he was not of the Tara stock. After his death King Maelshechlainn of Tara resumed the high-kingship.

In his treatment of the Icelandic sources G. follows chiefly the views of E. Ó Sveinsson (in *Um Njála* 1933). Like EÓS and others, G. assumes a **Brjáns saga*, from around 1200, utilized in *Njála* and *Þorstens saga Síðuhallssonar*. But unlike EÓS, he argues that *Darraðar-ljóð* can have had no place in this **Brjáns s*. His reasons are, partly (p. xiii) that *Darr*, being pagan in character, constitutes a foreign element in the Christian **Brjáns s*, partly that *Darr*. contradicts the events as represented in **Brjáns s*., since the poem presents the Norsemen as victorious (p. 74 ff.). Neither of these reasons seems conclusive to me. The poem *Darr*. is part and parcel of a portent, a vision, appearing on the day of the battle to a man in Katanes (Caithness), a similar event also happening to a man in the Faroe Islands. This portent, with the poem, is (in *Njála*, our only source) put at the head of a list of wonders, less formidable, perhaps, but one of them at least as heathen in character as the *Darr*-vision. I refer to the mysterious

disappearance of Hárekr, which G finds quite appropriate as an Irish folklore element in **Brjáns s.*

But though I can see no valid reason why the author of **Brjáns s.* should not utilize the pagan *Darraðar-ljóð* in his saga, I quite agree with G. as to the unmistakably Irish origin of the motif complex in this remarkable poem

In conclusion let it be said that this dissertation seems to be a solid piece of work not to be overlooked by those who are interested in Irish or Icelandic literature and folklore.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

The Johns Hopkins University

Beowulf The Monsters and the Critics. By J. R. R. TOLKIEN.
(Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture, British Academy,
1936. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol.
xxii) London Humphrey Milford Pp. 53 3s.

In the title of this lecture, I fear, there is a slight suggestion that may lead critics to hesitate before saying anything further about the poem, and even perhaps anything about the address itself. Yet the moral of what Mr. Tolkien has to offer is that the monsters referred to, Grendel and the dragon, are perfectly placed where they belong and contribute to the meaning of *Beowulf* as nothing else could. If the substance of his remarks is a little thin, he presents a type of criticism of which more is needed on medieval literature, and he does this with learning and skill. Indeed he is more indebted to the philologists, mythologists, and archeologists, than his comments on them might imply. Without their labors he could hardly have made the penetrating observation that "The illusion of historical truth and perspective, that has made *Beowulf* seem such an attractive quarry, is largely a product of art" (p. 5.). The same is true when with regard to the opposition between two halves of each line in the poem, "of roughly equivalent phonetic weight, and significant content," he says "They are more like masonry than music" (p. 31), although here we may ask him to define "music" or to turn his attention to certain ancient and modern varieties. He might in fact have spent even more time contemplating monsters in old stories, with reference, for example, to such a point as Lawrence makes about the plot as a whole "But the poet was powerless to alter the fact that Beowulf was killed by the dragon, and that his people came to grief when he no longer ruled over them. The story was too well known to make radical alterations . . . possible."¹ Such a reason may well explain why the poet

¹ W. W. Lawrence, *Beowulf and Epic Tradition*, Cambridge [Mass.], 1928, p. 217

kept to the order in which he gives the episodes. For artistically, I believe, the supernatural overtones of horror surrounding Grendel and his dame would have furnished an even greater climax.

Lawrence's essay offers many other points worth consideration. Thus he says "The poet is rather shy of definite description of the dragon, as is his habit when dealing with the supernatural. A monster is more fearful if pictured in the imagination."² These ideas supplement what Tolkien has in mind when he observes "Beowulf's dragon . . . is not to be blamed for being a dragon, but rather for not being dragon enough, plain pure fairy-story dragon" (p. 16). Further details regarding the imperfect adaptation of the pagan story to a Christian theme might have been taken from the same study. But the present lecture covers much and its main contention is sound.

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

Altfranzösische Grammatik Erster Teil Lautlehre. Von HANS RHEINFELDER München Hueber, 1937 Pp. xv + 323.

Evolution et structure de la langue française. Par WALTHER VON WARTBURG. Deuxième édition Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 1937 Pp. viii + 290.

Éléments de phonologie française Par GEORGES GOUGENHEIM Paris Les Belles Lettres, 1935. Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, Série Initiation et Méthode, fasc. 7. Pp. 136

Mr Rheinfelder's book is probably the most explicit text of the sort, the one most resembling a *viva voce* explanation and class discussion of phonetic etymology. The author is at great pains to acquaint his students with the physiological and psychological realities behind sound changes, does not shrink from long and detailed explanations as often as they are needed, and is lavish in his collection of examples. The meaning of each word cited is given, and semantic change indicated all the way from Latin to Modern French. Sound changes, too, are carried through to modern times with a prominent diagram indicating the development to c. 1100 A. D. In every way these 322 impeccably printed pages offer a notable example of the virtues of order, unflagging attention to detail, and good pedagogical sense. The author has

² *Ibid.*, p. 206

realized that the body of historical French phonetics is not to be reduced entirely to law, and he is honest in presenting the numerous exceptions or contradictions not in footnotes but in full type above the line. And yet, on occasion, he ventures to formulate a law, like his predecessors, Schwan and Behrens, when the small number of available examples scarcely call for that honor (two examples on p. 141).

In a book so full, not to say discursive, one is surprised to find that no use is made of the principles of regression and false regression and that the explanation of Gilléron for *join*, *avoue*, *mouns* is not even mentioned. To account for these words, and for *craie*, *monnaie*, *verre*, etc., by dialectal influence or borrowing seems rather old-fashioned today. Another regrettable omission is that of a *Worterverzeichnis*, promised for the end of the second volume (*Formenlehre*), where it will not render the services it would at the end of the first.

Mr. Rheinfelder's manual, being in German, is of course not destined to wide popularity among American students. Moreover, it is long and detailed and, if I am a good judge, we shall soon see, in the courses on the history of French offered in American universities, a marked diminution in the time and importance accorded to the memorizing of phonetic laws. This will be due, not to the attack on phonetic law as such, but rather to the broadened scope of language history. Fifty years ago phonology, or phonetic etymology, was the principal and proudest monument of Romance Philology, since then the work of Ferdinand Brunot has appeared, and scores of other scholars have made notable contributions. Synchronic linguistics is knocking at the door and may hope to find a place beside historical grammar. When this wealth of knowledge is more widely diffused, and put into manuals, it will be ready to become the stuff of university instruction.

Pointing the way to what may be done in this direction is Mr. von Wartburg's *Evolution et structure de la langue française*, a book of many merits, among which should not be overlooked that of being written in French. To put so much substantial information on all phases of the history of French into less than three hundred pages, accessible and interesting to the general reader as well as to the student, is a credit to the author's judgment and taste as well as to his erudition. Of necessity drawing on the work of many scholars, notably Brunot, this little volume is none the less notably original in plan and in many of its parts, more so than a modest preface would indicate. Here will be found, for example, brief presentation of the author's superstratum theory for the diphthongization of vowels in French, and of his correlations between dialect boundaries and the settlements of Germanic tribes over the territory of Roman Gaul. And at the other end of the book, the last chapter, *L'état actuel de la langue française*, is particularly satisfying for its skillful analysis

and characterization. One regrets it is not longer, particularly in the section called *Le français avancé*.

In a sketch of restricted dimensions there cannot be a place for everything, and it would be possible to reproach Professor Wartburg for this or that omission and, on the other hand, to question the necessity or importance of a paragraph here and there. The present reviewer, for example, has the impression that the literary language and the work of certain writers—masters of the language, to be sure—are given disproportionate attention, which might be reduced and a place made for the characterization of certain contemporary types of French: the languages of journalism, of the bureaucracy, and particularly of politics: the latter daily finds new ways of disproving the adage of Rivarol.

This second edition differs from the first (Leipzig, Teubner, 1934) in the addition of some thirty or forty pages on the language of the nineteenth century, which correct a regrettable tapering-off in the earlier redaction. The new pages (209-40) are well and clearly printed, but the rest is reproduced from the first edition by an offset process not good enough to avoid insufficient inking, blurred outlines, and frequent misalignment.

The sense of the word *phonologie* in Mr. Gougenheim's title is that made familiar by the work of Trubetzkoy and the Cercle Linguistique de Prague: "La phonétique d'une langue étudie les sons ou phonèmes existant dans cette langue, la phonologie étudie les phonèmes en tant qu'ils ont une valeur significative ou fonctionnelle." Chance has brought it about that French and English terminology for this new branch of linguistics clash at several points. The French *phonologie*, *phonème*, and *unité phonologique* correspond to the English *phonemics*, *phone*, and *phoneme* respectively, English *phonology* refers of course to *la phonétique historique*. As an additional complication, *phonologie* was used in a different sense by De Saussure, and his priority has recently been defended by Mr. Grammont who would call the new science, toward which he is markedly cool, *néophonologie*.

Although its nomenclature is perhaps neither as novel nor as unambiguous as might be hoped for, phonemics itself is a welcome and invigorating discipline. The present reviewer is particularly attracted by its indirect pedagogical value, feeling that it may point the way toward more efficient ways of training the ear of students learning a foreign language. In this respect phonemics is not so much to be opposed to phonetics as to be considered a part of it and a yardstick of instructional values.

Mr. Gougenheim's study shows the workmanship of a competent and resourceful linguist, and is of particular interest because it is the first survey of the complete phonemic structure of French, for, as Trubetzkoy has been at pains to point out, the science of phonemics rests upon a progression from the whole to the parts. Only in mapping the complete system of a language is the science

functioning to the full And, doubtless, only when so handled will phonemics make clear its essential aims and horizons What these are is not yet manifest, but it may be hoped that further studies and discussions will soon reveal them. In the meanwhile, it may not be out of place for a language teacher to derive, from studies such as these, an immediate if humble profit.

CHARLES A. KNUDSON

The University of Michigan

Two Old French Poems on Saint Thibaut Edited by R. T. HILL.
New Haven Yale University Press, 1936. Yale Romanic
Studies, XI Pp vi + 182.

L'Hystore Job Adaptation en vers français du *Compendium in Job* de Pierre de Blois Editée par R. C. BATES New Haven:
Yale University Press, 1937. Yale Romanic Studies, XIV.
Pp xxx + 291

The Old French Lives of Saint Agnes and other vernacular versions of the Middle Ages Edited by A. J. DENOMY. Cambridge
Harvard University Press, 1938 Harvard Studies in Romance
Languages, XIII Pp. xi + 283.

The three works here listed together have in common that they are editions by North American scholars (Mr Denomy is affiliated with the Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto) of thirteenth century French texts, based on Latin originals, in the category of religious literature. Each text is found in a single MS only, all are in verse, the work of not ungifted poets

To Mr Bates has fallen the good fortune of having the most interesting and the longest poem to edit (3336 lines) Not too well described by its title, the *Hystore Job* is a translation, with original additions, of the *Compendium in Job* of Peter of Blois, based in turn on the *Moralia in liber Job* of Gregory the Great Its content is a combination of Christian and lay morals, with censorious and satirical comments on human shortcomings The term of "sermon" given it by Mr Bates is hardly applicable, considering its length and its none too unified construction, moreover, I do not find convincing the arguments advanced by the editor (p xvii-xxi) to prove that the work was intended for oral presentation Be that as it may, the *Hystore Job* has an honorable place in Old French didactic literature, and has been edited with the care and competence that it deserved. The notes are full and

explicit, a table permits the reader to see at a glance which lines are from Peter of Blois and which are original, the glossary (100 pp in length) is complete and well-arranged. In the latter, I would point out that "chaînes" is a careless gloss for "cheps," and that the gloss for "laisset" in l. 3043 is confusing and unnecessary. Mr. Bates writes in French, a practice to be commended.

Of the two texts on St. Thibaut published by Mr. Hill, one, an *épître farcie*, is of 398 octosyllables, the other consists of 1058 alexandrins arranged in brief *laisses*. Unpublished when the present edition was undertaken, poem II was published in 1929 by Miss Helen Manning as a Columbia dissertation. Mr. Hill explains in his introduction his reasons for carrying on with his own project, one of the best of these was his discovery of the MS referred to by Mabillon as the Codex Uticensis and containing the Latin *Vita* most closely resembling the longer poem, below which it is now printed. Less interesting to this reviewer than the comparison between the Latin and the French of Poem II is the comparison between Poem I and Poem II, which in choice of meter and in length offer such neat indices to the personalities of the two authors. One has the merits of brevity and simplicity, the other's gravity and careful rhetoric is perhaps more in keeping with their subject. Mr. Hill has listed at length the characteristic linguistic features of the manuscript and of each poet, the notes include material gathered on the editor's "pilgrimages" to places in Europe, such as Provins and the neighborhood of Vicenza, which figure prominently in the saint's life. The glossary is exhaustive.

Mr. Denomy's book suffers in several respects by a comparison with the two others in this group, first of all because its content is less unified. To quote from the publisher's note:

This volume presents an edition of a hitherto unpublished Old French Life of Saint Agnes, ms. B. N. Fr. 1553, accompanied by a study of the language and dialect of the poem. It presents a mixture of Picard and Francian forms, and linguistic evidence points to the middle of the thirteenth century as the time of composition. The Introduction reviews the scholarship dealing with the origin and growth of the St. Agnes legend. Appendices present for the first time four other versions of the legend. A further section of the book studies some eleven versions of the legend in the vernacular languages of mediaeval Western Europe.

The thousand lines of the principal text are a little lost in all this, the more so as they are printed in smaller type than the rest of the book. They are preceded by a diligent study of the language, followed by helpful notes and, 175 pages farther on, by five pages of glossary. It is regrettable that the acute accent is not used over tonic E, final or before final S. Brief notes on details follow:

P. 53 n., Tobler's work is inaccurately cited. P. 55, 23 suppress. P. 56, 26 "The change of '-rée' to 'ie' is hard to explain." Here, as in other places, Mr. Denomy's linguistic introduction tries to do too much. The

reader scarcely expects detailed remarks or new light on historical phonetics P 60, 7 -*aige* is probably no more than a spelling here P 86, l 623 *Li*, not *le* Cf the note to this line The change of *mal* to *mals* is not imperative P 120 The *Histoire littéraire de la France* is called the *Histoire de la littérature française* here, again on p 175, and in the Bibliography The article on prose lives of saints in Old French in volume 33 is attributed, incorrectly, to Gaston Paris on p 120, to Paul Meyer, correctly, on p 175 P 189 I do not see how the line *Si com Renars traï Isengrim, son compere* "would seem to indicate a composition after *Renard le Nouvel* written by Jacquemars Gélée of Lille in 1288" P. 266 Page references to articles in periodicals should be given

Of the three editors, two have made systematic listings of the linguistic features of their texts. The other, Mr. Bates, explains his omission as follows:

D'abord, Ewald Scherping, dans une petite thèse, publiée en 1904, a analysé, avec compétence, les phénomènes linguistiques du poème . . . On a publié des centaines d'études séparées sur la langue de différents scribes et auteurs picards, des centaines de collections de détails si j'avais, à mon tour, étudié la langue de l'*Hystore* mieux et plus à fond que Scherping, ce qui n'aurait pas été très difficile, je n'aurais pas ajouté un seul fait à ce qu'on sait déjà Ce dont on a plutôt besoin, c'est d'une étude d'ensemble qui ne soit pas un travail de répétition.

This reviewer joins Mr. Bates heartily in calling for such a book, having felt for some time that a great deal of patient compilation is being done to no good purpose. Romance philology is no longer in the age of Tobler and Forster, and there is no reason to imitate their studies of the *Dis dou vrai aniel* or the *Reimpredigt* Moreover, thirteenth century texts show many interchanges across dialect boundaries and enough of a departure from good phonetic spelling to make such studies very delicate A substantial essay on the usages of this period is much needed, after which editors will be quit for pointing out the unusual or exceptional in their texts.

CHARLES A. KNUDSON

The University of Michigan

Denkform und Gemeinschaft bei Jules Romains Von EDGAR GLÄSSER. (Romanische Studien, unter Mitwirkung der Herren Universitätsprofessoren: Ph. A. Becker, M. Friedwagner, E. Wechssler . . . , herausgegeben von Dr. Emil Ebering, Heft 46). Berlin · Verlag Emil Ebering. 1938. Pp. 89.

Quand on voudra étudier l'avachissement intellectuel de la pensée en Allemagne sous l'influence de l'idéologie "national-socialiste," on trouvera dans ce fascicule du privat-docent à l'Université de Heidelberg Glasser un exemple typique: aucune précision de l'idée, rien

que de vagues et vastes déclamations, de la propagande idéologique et du métafouillis. On voudrait faire plier la réalité à certains préjugés bien assis dans l'âme du pseudo-savant. Il s'agit de prouver que l'unanimité de J. Romans (qui serait un "Sozial-mythus") a évolué vers un "gemeinschaftsbildender Raumgeist" qui culmine dans "Blutmystik" et "Blutmythos" (*Préface à l'Homme Blanc*). Par conséquent—nous l'apprenons dès la préface—ceux qui n'aiment plus le peuple allemand depuis qu'il s'est "trouvé" et qui sont les mêmes qui voyaient des valeurs sociales seulement dans l'"untermenschliche Gier und Greuel" de la psychanalyse, ne pourront pas comprendre l'essai de compréhension de la poésie de la "Gemeinschaftsseele" qu'a tenté M. Glässer. En n'insistant pas sur l'amour profond pour l'éternelle Allemagne de ceux qui persistent à croire que "la cupidité et les atrocités infra-humaines" de l'Allemagne actuelle prouvent plutôt son égarement, je ferai remarquer que le "mythe de l'Homme Blanc" n'est pas identique au "mythe de l'Homme Allemand" et que l'unanimité juvénile de Romans a plutôt défié les groupes passagers qui se nouent et se dénouent capricieusement dans une caserne, une église, une ville, que les entités nationales ou raciales. Romans s'est inspiré (probablement à son insu) à la psychologie de Lebon plutôt qu'à M. Rosenberg. Comme tout doit être ramené à des valeurs "allemandes," la poésie "L'Individu" de J. Romans doit trahir la "Denkform des Stirb- und Werde-motivs"—mais qui ne voit la différence entre l'anéantissement partiel et éphémère de l'individu de Romans dans le collectif de la ville et l'idée goethéenne de la renaissance des espèces par la mort des individus, qui ne voit la frivolité de la comparaison d'une poésie finissant sur le vers *Je connais le bonheur de n'être presque (!) pas* avec les vers brûlants de nostalgie cosmique de l'âme voulant renaître dans "Selige Sehnsucht"? Il faudrait pourtant chérir un peu davantage les véritables valeurs allemandes. . . . Il est d'ailleurs curieux de voir notre critique se confiner dans l'étude des débuts littéraires de son auteur et éviter d'en traiter l'œuvre centrale, le roman-fleuve "Les hommes de bonne volonté", sous prétexte que cela sortirait du cadre de son travail et qu'il n'a pu se procurer tous les volumes de la série!—selon la vérité probable parce que dans cette œuvre le récit objectif prime le lyrisme unanimiste et parce qu'on y voit, au moins dans les volumes parus, peu d'allusions au mythe du sang ni même d'adhésion intime à l'idéal national. (M. Glässer pense que les "Hommes de bonne volonté" sont ceux qui considèrent le bien et le mal comme racialement déterminés.) Ayant moi-même traité dans le temps du style unanimiste, je ne puis voir aujourd'hui dans ces métaphores se répétant indéfiniment et tirées de la digestion, de l'ingurgitation et du vomissement, qu'une recette commode (commode aussi à l'analyse du "stylisticien"), que M. Romans a eu raison d'abandonner dans une œuvre mûre. Toute réalité est

défigurée, violentée dans cet opuscule à l'enthousiasme bon marché de M. Glasser on ne peut même se fier aux citations de textes p ex le passage cité de "Les Hommes de bonne volonté" III/17, qui est placé à la fin de l'opuscule en guise de soi-disant "confession" de J. Romans (dans laquelle M. Glasser prétend pouvoir communiquer avec l'auteur au nom d'une "obligation commune")

Ce qu'il faut pour oser faire le rêve de modifier la Société, ce qu'aucune énergie ne remplace, le vieux mot d'"idéal" le désigne,

n'est pas du tout une confession de J. Romans, mais une des idées qui passent par la tête d'un de ses héros. Le passage continue en effet "*Mais d'une façon si usée, si convenue, que la bouche a l'impression de mâcher de la phrase morte pour bavards*". Quant à la chose même, Jerphanion se la représente avec force. On voit que le personnage de J. Romans oppose au mot "idéal"—qui lui semble trivial et désuet—la chose, la réforme sociale. Singulière "confession" que Romans démentirait dans la ligne suivante!

LEO SPITZER

Mallarmé, Ein Dichter des Jahrhundert-Endes. Von KURT WAIS.
München C. H. Beck, 1938. Pp 548

La métaphore dans l'œuvre de Stéphane Mallarmé Par DEBORAH
A. K. AISH Paris Droz, 1938 Pp 210 (Thèse de
Doctorat de l'Université de Paris.)

On ne saurait désormais étudier Mallarmé sans utiliser l'important ouvrage que M. Wais vient de lui consacrer. C'est presque une somme de ce qu'on pourrait appeler l'histoire intellectuelle extérieure du poète. M. Wais ne se soucie guère d'intuitions profondes sur la personnalité de Mallarmé, de reconstruction par l'intérieur de son œuvre (ce qui le rend injustement sévère pour l'ouvrage de Thibaudet, pp 7-8), mais il a voulu écrire un livre "geistesgeschichtlich," et faire intervenir, au même titre que l'histoire proprement littéraire, tous les facteurs sociaux, philosophiques, politiques, historiques, psychologiques, qui ont eu ou ont pu avoir de l'influence sur l'œuvre de Mallarmé. Son étude est conçue comme une biographie qui fait place à chaque instant à la discussion des textes ou des problèmes nécessaires, et aux rapports qu'a entretenus Mallarmé, ou simplement aux rapprochements qu'il suggère, avec tous les personnages, idées ou faits qu'il est possible de connaître. Presque tous les poèmes ou textes en prose importants sont analysés et commentés, presque tous les problèmes que pose l'œuvre sont abordés. On trouve à la fin une excellente bibliographie,

dont on regrette qu'elle ne concerne que les œuvres de Mallarmé et leurs traductions, et un Index des noms propres, qui aurait pu être complété par un Index rerum

Ce travail considérable est malheureusement d'utilisation difficile, et sa méthode appelle quelques réserves. M. Wais semble accorder la même autorité à des sources très différentes, que d'ailleurs il ne mentionne pas toujours. Pourtant les déclarations de Mallarmé, les volumes de souvenirs de ses contemporains, les manuscrits non encore publiés, et la tradition orale, si impoissante sui. certains points, mais si sujette à caution, ne devaient pas être traités de la même façon. Ainsi, on ne sait d'où est tirée la liste (pp. 277-8) de quelques-uns des habitués des fameux mardis de la rue de Rome, qu'il serait bon pourtant d'établir une bonne fois en entier avec une critique rigoureuse. Dans le détail, l'ordre des idées est difficile à suivre, et on passe souvent sans raison apparente d'une idée à une autre. Le livre est écrit dans une langue inutilement compliquée et obscure, germanique à l'excès (les citations mêmes sont le plus souvent traduites en allemand), qui exige un véritable déchiffrement si l'on ne possède pas parfaitement la langue. Trop souvent des idées intéressantes et neuves sont indiquées sans être poussées jusqu'aux conséquences qu'elles comportent : ainsi les quelques titres d'ouvrages sur la mode cités p. 188 pouvaient fournir une histoire suggestive, ainsi, pour les procédés de langage, une intéressante opposition de la "transposition" et de la "structure" (p. 332) mène à plusieurs idées justes, mais pas à des applications précises, ou alors celles-ci sont très discutables (p. 354). Je ne mentionne que pour mémoire des concessions aux idées officielles de l'Allemagne actuelle, trop visibles pour pouvoir induire en erreur : recherche du "Volkstümliche" chaque fois que c'est possible (pp. 9, 96, 238, 320), démentie d'ailleurs par l'aveu final (p. 450), mention des Juifs (pp. 250, 278, 310), des cheveux blonds et des yeux bleus des femmes (pp. 53, 57, 193, 197), importance excessive donnée à Wagner (cité 33 fois) et à Houston Stewart Chamberlain, utilisé en quelque sorte comme garant de Mallarmé (pp. 1, 427), exaltation de Stefan George (cité 49 fois), parfois même aux dépens de Mallarmé (p. 169).

Mais si ce livre ne présente pas vraiment de thèse, ne renouvelle pas la figure de Mallarmé, il est exempt des préjugés trop souvent répandus par une critique inférieure à sa tâche, ainsi les rapports de l'art et de la vie (p. 323), ceux de la musique et de la poésie (p. 355 sqq.) sont montrés dans leur vraie lumière, et la sympathie de M. Wais pour la personne et l'œuvre de Mallarmé, quoique parfois dissimulée, est indéniable.

Dans la masse de faits et d'idées que rassemble l'ouvrage, on notera les nouveautés suivantes au point de vue biographique, d'intéressants détails sur le mariage du poète (p. 53 sqq.), presque tous tirés de la correspondance inédite avec Cazalis, sur sa vie à

Paris (p. 170 sqq.) et sur les femmes qu'il a connues (p. 192 sqq.), en particulier sur Méry Laurent (p. 197 sqq.), dont la physionomie est reconstituée de la façon la plus vraisemblable et la plus équitable. L'ensemble fait un Mallarmé bien plus humain que ne le représente d'ordinaire la critique française. L'étude de l'influence de Poe (cité 62 fois) et de Villiers de l'Isle-Adam (cité 45 fois) est très poussée. M. Wais insiste aussi justement sur le conflit faustien entre l'intelligence et la vie, sans marquer suffisamment son lien avec la hantise du personnage d'Hamlet. L'idée de la persistance d'une enfance idéale chez le poète (p. 444 sqq.) pouvait mener loin, et se compléter en particulier par une étude du thème de la naissance, qu'il aurait fallu, il est vrai, traiter par la psychanalyse, interdite à un Allemand d'aujourd'hui. Enfin, pour l'exégèse, outre des contributions à certains problèmes de détail déjà presque aussi traditionnels que les *ἀπορίαι* homériques (Anastase, p. 448, Palmes, p. 469), mentionnons une interprétation en partie nouvelle d'un passage de *l'Après-Midi d'un Faune* (p. 153 sqq.), où se mêlent curieusement un heureux rappel de la légende de la nymphe Syrinx, un sentiment faustien d'insuffisance, les idées esthétiques de Schiller, et une référence inavouée à la notion psychanalytique de sublimation (on chercherait d'ailleurs en vain dans l'Index le nom de Freud).

Moins ambitieuse, la thèse de Mlle Aïsh se borne à étudier, mais clairement et avec rigueur, les métaphores de Mallarmé, par quoi il faut entendre "toute expression figurée dès qu'il y a analogie entre des notions et des objets soit concrets soit abstraits" (p. 3). Après un début un peu trop rapide (l'auteur l'avoue p. 18), le ch. II montre par des détails bien choisis l'importance de l'analogie dans l'esprit de Mallarmé (qu'une analyse souvent faite, et toujours à faux, du célèbre poème en prose sur la mort de la Pénultième, ne confirme nullement), classe ensuite les métaphores suivant leur point d'origine sensoriel, ce qui amène des réflexions intéressantes sur la personnalité de Mallarmé, et montre les directions dans lesquelles les métaphores se développent. Les thèmes des métaphores sont classés de façon très complète dans le ch. III, qui montre que la réalité à laquelle s'intéressait Mallarmé (nature, intérieur, idées, etc.) est bien plus vaste qu'on ne croit généralement. Le ch. IV est la rhétorique du poète, il étudie minutieusement et avec beaucoup de finesse les nombreuses formes que prennent les métaphores (le plan en est moins net ainsi la périphrase, traité p. 125 sqq., est reprise p. 151). Enfin les deux derniers ch. montrent avec d'excellents exemples comment Mallarmé perfectionnait ses métaphores et comment il les combinait en une technique musicale. La conclusion indique une influence qui, même limitée aux débuts de Ghil et de Valéry, ne semble pas convaincante. L'ouvrage se termine par une bibliographie un peu sommaire.

Certaines idées sont discutables. L'intellectualisme de Mallarmé (pp. 10, 11, 15) paraît surfait, peut-être sous l'influence de Valéry,

dont une idée (p. 186) est attribuée à Mallarmé, comme il est fréquent. Le problème de la sincérité (pp. 23, 51, 99) ne se pose guère. Il y a quelques erreurs. L'importance du théâtre est méconnue (p. 103), en particulier le lustre, loin d'être un "détail technique," est un symbole essentiel. Le mot "aucun" cité p. 120 n'a pas de sens négatif et signifie *un* comme le latin *aliquis*. Les mots (p. 121) ne sont pas extraordinaires en eux-mêmes. Le procédé de l'arrêt brusque par un monosyllabe, critiqué p. 176, est constant chez Mallarmé. Enfin on est surpris de trouver dans un travail en général bien et même agréablement écrit un assez grand nombre d'expressions incorrectes et d'anglicismes.

Ces réserves portent presque toutes, on le voit, sur ce qui n'est pas la métaphore. Mais quand Mlle Aish traite son sujet propre, elle le fait avec beaucoup de clarté, de force et d'habileté, et ses citations sont remarquablement choisies, présentées, commentées, et classées, ce qui, dans un sujet de ce genre, est l'essentiel.

JACQUES SCHERER

Swarthmore College

The Imitations of "Don Quixote" in the Spanish Drama By
GREGORY GOUGH LAGRONE. Philadelphia, U of Pa., 1937.
Publications in Romanic Languages and Literature, 27. Pp
vii, 145

The influence of Cervantes has engaged the attention of various students of Spanish literature in recent years in England, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and the United States. Their studies include the borrowings in Spain and in foreign countries from *Don Quixote*, the *Novelas exemplares*, and the dramatic works of the famous Spaniard. Although great interest has been shown in the inspiration derived from *Don Quixote*, scant consideration has been taken of the influence of this masterpiece upon the Spanish theater. We are indebted to Dr. Lagrone for filling this gap. Extending his study of *Don Quixote* in the Spanish drama from the early part of the seventeenth century down through the centenary celebrations, he has dealt with more than one hundred Spanish dramatic works. This broad investigation has enabled him to make a careful analysis of the evolution in the interpretation of the book and its characters over three centuries. The material treated is broader than the title of the book would indicate because it includes a summary of the preceding works by other scholars on the influence of *Don Quixote* in foreign countries and a comparison of the attitude toward the work outside of Spain with the Spanish opinion of it.

The extensive bibliography indicates that L. has spared no pains in an effort to command all the available material that bears directly on the subject as well as that indirectly related to it but which affords a basis for comparison. Consequently, he is well equipped for his conclusions that the development in the interpretation of *Don Quixote* usually parallels the official criticism and that the interpretation varies from the early conception of the characters in their superficial aspects to the more accurate esteem accorded them from the last part of the nineteenth century to the present. With L's statement of the French opinion of Don Quixote in the seventeenth century (p. 2) I am not in complete agreement because, in addition to Saint-Evremond and La Fontaine, whom he mentions as two French writers of this period who correctly evaluated the Spanish knight, the mid-century dramatist Guyon Guérin de Bouscal should certainly be named as a Frenchman who appreciated the true significance of Cervantes' hero.

A valuable part of this book for students of Spanish literature are the summaries and criticisms of Spanish plays that are not well known and are not easily accessible. Other important features of the work are the Bibliographical List of Plays with their dates and principal references and the Selective Bibliography which enumerates the leading Cervantes bibliographies, the studies of Cervantine influence and interpretation in France, Germany, England, Italy, Portugal, and Spain, and essays and critical studies on the subject.

ESTHER J. CROOKS

Goucher College

BRIEF MENTION

Pierre Jurieu und seine Auseinandersetzung mit Antoine Arnauld im Streit um die Rechtsfertigungs- und Gnadenlehre. Von HILDE DAUM. Marburg: Bebel, 1937. Pp. 167. (Marburger Beiträge zur Rom. Philologie, Heft xxiii.) C'est une étude consciencieuse reflétant bien les subtilités de cette polémique où l'auteur du XX^e siècle semble se perdre souvent aussi complètement que Jussieu et Arnauld eux-mêmes, le premier avec ses trois "fois" (foy opérante—de S. Paul, foy morte—de S. Jacques, foy assoupie et en défaillance—des fidèles dans leurs chûtes mortelles), le second avec ses quatre "états" (*ante legem, sub lege, sub gratiâ, in pace*). Selon le premier l'homme est tout à fait mort par le péché, selon le second l'homme n'est que malade, selon le premier la grâce est "suffisante", selon le second elle ne l'est pas—et voici son argument (excellent exemple du ton de ces querelles)

La foy est inseparable de toutes les vertus chrétiennes—assure Jurieu—et par conséquent de la chasteté. Or, il arrive souvent, par leur propre aveu, que les vrais fidèles commettent des adultères sans perdre la foy. Ils ne perdent donc point non plus, en commettant des adultères, la vertu de la chasteté, et ainsi par un privilege particulier ce sont des chastes adultères (cité p. 91).

Ailleurs les choses se présentent autrement et font voir que les causes du débat sont toutes pragmatiques, pourrait-on dire. Jurieu dit au fond: Vous, Jansénistes, êtes de vrais calvinistes avec votre doctrine du salut par la grâce—donc pourquoi ne vous séparez-vous pas de Rome? Arnauld dit au fond: Vous, Jurieu, vous n'êtes pas calviniste puisque vous reconnaissez l'autorité au moins partielle de la raison dans les questions de foi, comme l'Eglise qui reconnaît l'autorité de la Bible, de la Tradition et de la Raison—donc pourquoi ne rentrez-vous pas dans l'Eglise?

Et si nous comprenons bien la conclusion de Dame Hilde Daum, Jurieu n'aurait pas le droit en effet de parler au nom du calvinisme, car il n'était déjà plus calviniste par son penchant pour les idées du XVIII^e siècle et philosophique (cf. p. 35). Opinons qu'il est plus sage de se renseigner sur ces querelles dans le lumineux ouvrage de P. Hazard, *La Crise de la Conscience européenne, 1680-1815* (1935).

Ce qu'on trouvera de spécialement frappant dans le livre de H. Daum, c'est le spectacle de deux grands chrétiens s'abreuvant d'injures abondamment, continuant la bonne tradition du XVI^e siècle, et d'ailleurs celle de la *rabies theologica* de tous les temps.

ALBERT SCHINZ

The University of Pennsylvania

Joseph de Maistre et l'Angleterre. Par F. HOLDSWORTH. Paris: Champion, 1935. Pp. x + 323. Un des nombreux ouvrages entrepris à la suggestion de M. Baldensperger pour la "Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature comparée." Il était en effet fort intéressant d'attirer l'attention sur cette appréciation des idées anglaises du XVIII^e siècle par un Français—un Français qui, cette fois, cependant, apprécie en réactionnaire. Dans les fameux parallèles Français-Anglais de Bèat de Muralt, Voltaire et Rousseau (sans compter Prévost et Diderot) ceux-ci avaient invariablement appuyé sur le côté admiration pour les idées d'Outre-Manche. Mais le siècle philosophique tire à sa fin et voici Joseph de Maistre qui avait été élevé dans un milieu très traditionaliste, avait commencé (comme Chateaubriand) par s'enthousiasmer pour les Anglais, mais qui avait fini par aboutir en fin de compte à une repudiation à peu près complète du déisme philosophique et retomber dans une orthodoxie philosophique et chrétienne qui défie celle de Pascal même: ce sont

les doctrines les plus difficiles à accepter pour la raison—celle de l'expiation, celle de la "présence réelle du corps et du sang de Christ sous les espèces du pain et du vin," la fonction divine du bourreau . et toutes les autres—qui sont défendues non pas au nom du "cœur qui a ses raisons que la raison ne connaît pas," mais au nom de la raison raisonnante des "philosophes" eux-mêmes M Holdsworth a sans doute raison en affirmant qu'on n'avait pas accordé assez d'attention à cette défense si originale des idées chrétiennes (il n'y a guère aujourd'hui que Maurras qui rappelle parfois l'intérêt de la dialectique de de Maistre), mais on aura peut-être le désir d'en relire l'exposé dans l'original, le livre de notre auteur paraît un peu surchargé de discussions piodixes, il rappelle lui-même que le travail de Joseph de Maistre supputant les idées anglaises avait été déjà "un travail de mise au point", il se trouve ainsi que nombre de pages ici sont encore une mise au point de mise au point, un aperçu plus exclusivement objectif n'aurait-il pas suffi? La bibliographie à la fin du volume paraît en vérité surabondante

ALBERT SCHINZ

The University of Pennsylvania

Anecdotes of painting in England, 1760-1795, with some account of the principal artists, and incidental notes on other arts, collected by HORACE WALPOLE, and now digested and published from his original MSS By FREDERICK W. HILLES and PHILIP B DAGHLIAN. Vol. 5 *New Haven* Yale University Press, 1937 Pp xvi + 262 \$3 00 The well-known volumes called Walpole's *Anecdotes* should rather have been known as George Vertue's, as Walpole was the first to own Nothing, however, can dim his credit and devotion in publishing Vertue's notes. The very name chosen by the Walpole Society, which now is publishing Vertue in full, handsomely recognizes this The publication of what Walpole himself collected for future research—his *Anecdotes of Painting in England* (1760-95)—helps us to measure the difference between an artist with a passion for retrieving the past and a dilettante benevolently interested Vertue's main source of material was original research Walpole's news-sheets clippings Vertue's judgments were based on his standard of professional knowledge and often confirmed or amended by observation Walpole judged from his smarter level and his often arbitrary theory and seems hardly ever to have observed the essence of a picture for himself. From his material on Reynolds, Gainsborough, Cotes and Romney he seems not to have noticed that there was anything phenomenal about them. It is not unfair to quote his sole comment on Richard Wilson. "Imitated Rembrandt. There is an account and head of Richard Wilson the landscape painter who died in 1782 in the *European*

Magazine for June 1790. He was born in 1714." His apparent confusion of Richard with Benjamin Wilson is a detail in this aridity. None the less Walpole's indolent industry in preserving so many bits of biography and gossip deserves our thanks and this especially applies to his material on architecture and architects and on amateurs. His editor's work seems exemplary.

*Huntington Library,
San Marino, California*

C. H. COLLINS BAKER

Drury Lane Calendar, 1747-1776 Compiled from the playbills and edited with an introduction by DOUGALD MACMILLAN. Published in co-operation with the Huntington Library Oxford Clarendon Press, 1938. Pp xxxiv + 364 \$7.00. Professor MacMillan has earned the gratitude of his fellow workers by providing this compilation, drawn principally from the Kemble-Devonshire playbills in the Huntington Library. These are annotated in J. P. Kemble's hand, chiefly in the form of transcriptions from the diaries of the prompters Cross and Hopkins. Where the collection is imperfect the editor has gone to other sources, and he has checked the whole calendar with newspaper notices and with Genest. The calendar gives the performances throughout Garrick's reign. It is followed by an alphabetical list of the plays, with dates and casts. The book is well indexed, and I can already testify from use unconnected with this review that it is a very helpful instrument. The introduction is a concise but interesting sketch of Drury Lane under Garrick.

H. S.

The Seafarer, An Interpretation. By O. S. ANDERSON. Lund. Gleerup, 1937. Pp 50. This little monograph grew out of an attempt to find an interpretation of the poem which would not require the interpreter to reject substantial parts of it as additions, interpolations or separate poems. Mr. Anderson defends the unity of the poem as it stands, on the theory that it is an autobiographical allegory. The seafaring so vividly pictured in lines 1 to 33a signifies the poet's actual life in this vale of tears. The seafaring anticipated so eagerly in lines 33b to 64a signifies the poet's death—he puts to sea this time on a voyage which will take him to the other side, that is, heaven. This section therefore signifies the poet's anticipated release from the worldly cares set forth in the first section of the poem. Lines 64b to 124 consist of general reflections on life, the poet's philosophy of life, if you will, an outgrowth of the personal experiences and emotions presented in allegorical form in the preceding sections of the poem. This philosophy is, in fact, merely another statement of familiar

Christian views about this world and the world to come. It gains a personal and lyric quality, however, in virtue of its connexion with the poet's autobiographical allegory. The primitivistic passage (lines 80b to 89) is of special interest here, Mr. Anderson might have added to the value of his essay by discussing it in terms of its historical background. In the note on *hwilpan* 21 (p 40), I miss a reference to Lehmann's note, Herrig's *Archiv* CXIX 435. On lines 111-116, see my note in *Medrum Ævum* VI 214. The essay as a whole gives us a plausible interpretation of this beautiful but obscure poem.

KEMP MALONE

Shakespeare Studies Hamlet By BLANCHE COLES New York Richard R Smith, 1938 Pp. xiv + 298 \$2.50. This commentary on *Hamlet*, paraphrasing practically every line in the play, will be of service both to students beginning to study *Hamlet* and to scholars who may feel that they have completed its study. It is decidedly useful particularly in connection with matters difficult to understand because of changes during the last three hundred years in language, customs, and ethics. Naturally scholars will not agree with all the interpretations favored by Miss Coles, a fact which renders the work no less valuable.

There is perhaps too frequent a tendency on the part of the writer to accept some entirely new and fanciful interpretations of Dover Wilson (pp. 44, 50, 89, 90, 121, 158). When, however, the commentary reaches problems of profound importance, Miss Coles is very fair in citing quotations from eminent authorities on both sides of a question (pp. 134-145). Often she suggests that the reader must make up his own mind on all matters. Miss Coles will find it difficult to secure converts to "sullied" rather than "solid" flesh, despite Dover Wilson (p 20), easier perhaps to convince us in favor of the contention of Joseph Quincy Adams against Miss Lily B. Campbell that revenge was ethically right as *Hamlet* emphasizes it, but entirely impossible to convince us at the very end (p 297) of the generally accepted idea that the reference in *Hamlet* to a future life is "against Shakespeare's custom." All of Shakespeare's supposedly greatest tragedies emphasize the future life at some point in their development. Even in the pagan play, *Lear*, Kent is going to meet the dead Lear, and Antony, the pagan, is to gather flowers with the Bohemian Cleopatra in the life to come. It is interesting to read this bold innovation in commentary along with that of Joseph Quincy Adams, published by Houghton Mifflin in 1935.

GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR

The University of North Carolina

Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1938 31ster Jahrgang. Herausgegeben vom Frankfurter Goethe-Museum Leipzig Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung 261 Ss Mit gewohnter Anmut und in tieferem Sinne mischt dies Jahr der Goethe-Kalender Forschung und Dichtung, denn die ersten Beiträge sind von deutschen Dichtern geschrieben Ernst Wiechert bekennt sich zu Goethe in *Vom Trost der Welt*, Rudolf G Binding sucht Mephistopheles' Einwirkung bei der Herstellung des Homunkulus auszuschneiden, ohne sich indessen mit dem Vers "Ich bin der Mann, das Glück ihm zu beschleunigen" (*Faust* 6684) überzeugend auseinanderzusetzen, Rudolf Alexander Schroder wirbt für eine höhere Wertung der *Natürlichen Tochter*, Karl Heinrich Waggerl führt uns in Großvater Textors Blumengarten

"Daß ich auf den folgenden Blättern mein Wissen über Goethe und Morike bekennen soll, erscheint mir [*u e* Ludwig Friedrich Barthel] wie eine heimliche Strafe, doch nicht einfältig, nicht verloren und wunschlos genug in ihren Gedichten gelesen zu haben" Uns erscheint es auch so, wie diese Stilprobe vielleicht schon ahnen läßt

George Madison Priest berichtet sachgemäß und mit interessanten Streiflichtern auf Princeton zur Zeit Goethes über "*Das Goethebild von Sebbers in Amerika*, seinen Wert und seine Schicksale, während Ernst Beutler, der Herausgeber des Buchleins und Direktor des Frankfurter Goethemuseums, mit reizendem Humor und fast biedermeierischer Sammlerfreude *Das Hausbuch des Großvaters Textor* charakterisiert und eine versunkene Bürgerwelt erstehen läßt. Der Aufsatz von Franz Gotting über *Dorothea Stock* gibt nicht nur einen Einblick in *Leben und Werk einer deutschen Malerin von 1800*, sondern zeigt, wie stark die Kreise der Großen jener Zeit, der Goethe, Schiller, Schlegel, Mozart sich mit dem der Korners überschneiden Ein Katalog der von Dora Stock gemalten Bilder nebst Ortsangaben schließt sich an.

ERNST FEISE

Das Schemenlaufen in Tirol und verwandte alpenländische Masken- und Faschachtsbräuche. Von ANTON DORRER 2 Auflage Innsbruck/Leipzig: Felizian Rauch, 1938 44 pages, 8 plates. RM 90. The noisy parades of masked men in Tyrolean villages at Shrove-tide are traced through the centuries, from their supposed symbolic cult-forms of the old Germans to the impressive baroque masquerades of today. The most important open-air festival of this kind takes place in the village of Imst every three or four years, and the author brings proof of its relation to other masquerades in Alpine districts. An exact description of the masks is supplemented

by detailed information on church interference, law-suits, and official efforts to suppress these customary parades.

Middlebury College

WERNER NEUSE

What Happens in Hamlet. By J DOVER WILSON Cambridge (England) at the University Press, New York, Macmillan, 1937 Pp xx + 344. \$3 50 The second edition of this much-discussed book (reviewed by Professor Parrott, *MLN.*, LII, 382-6) adds a pleasant and very sporting preface on its reception, a five-page endorsement by Mr Harold Child of some recent productions which carried out Professor Wilson's ideas, and seven pages of new notes

H. S.

CORRESPONDENCE

SCOTT'S BATTLE OF KILLIECRANKIE The title of Mr Strout's communication 'An unpublished ballad-translation by Scott' in the January issue of *MLN* is scarcely accurate His proviso that "it may have appeared in some contemporary collection" is justified, for Scott's translation was printed in *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal*, I, 380-1, Dec 29, 1832 It was printed from Hunter's copy, which must be the one now in the Morgan Library and from which Mr Strout transcribes his text, for the editors introduced the ballad by quoting Hunter's MS note

The text of the ballad has a few misreadings and different spellings (apart from the editors' punctuation) In the following list I give the stanza and line and the *Chambers's* reading. I, 1 Graham, 3 Southron (cf 'Southron' in Mr Strout's version v, 7), rout, chase, II, 1 Graham, 2 faith sustained (the Latin version 'intemerata' should have prevented this reading which makes nonsense), III, 3 sae . . Dunfermline; 5 Scotland's Nestor (which again does not make sense), VI, 3 'fenced' for 'knew', 7 Cannon, VIII, 1 Glenmorrison, IX, 1. Tummel's, 5 'who' for 'that.' The last two lines of stanza 1, deleted in the MS, are represented by stars in the *Chambers's* version

Although, therefore, the ballad has been printed before, it would seem that Mr Strout gives for the first time the correct readings

JAMES C CORSON

The library,

The University of Edinburgh

NOCMAL'S "DIE SONNE GEHT ZU GNADEN" Prof John A Walz (MLN, LIV, 8 ff), beweist mit einer erdrückenden Fülle von Belegen dass in den verschiedensten germanischen Sprachen *die Sonne geht zu Gnade(n)* (von der untergehenden Sonne gesagt) bedeutet 'geht zu Ruhe', besonders einige seiner frühneuhochdeutschen Beispiele zeigen diese Auffassung als die im 15/16 Jh herrschende. Er muss aber selbst gestehen dass mhd *ze genâden ist sin sêle* ebensogut die Bedeutung 'rest' als 'divine grace' enthalten kann (die letztere ist ahd allein belegt). Ich verstehe nicht wie Walz eine solche lexikographische Frage von der etymologischen trennen kann, da doch von ihr die Auffassung des Stimmungsgehalts des Wortes beeinflusst werden muss. Walz setzt sich mit H. Paul's Bemerkung, die Bedeutung 'Gemachlichkeit, Ruhe' sei "abgeleitet," nicht auseinander. Ich handle von Etymologie und Ursprung, Walz vom Wortgebrauch in bestimmten Perioden (übrigens habe ich selbst gesagt dass der Zusammenhang von *Gnade* mit *med(er)* "dem Sprachgefühls Roths nahezu liegen scheint"). Selbst wenn *Gnade* in *die Sonne geht zu Gnaden* in einer bestimmten Sprachperiode 'Ruhe' bedeutet, sollten die Obertöne von *Gnade* 'divine grace' nicht hereinschwingen? Wenn im Mhd. Sätze wie *du sêle fuor zen gnâden* ('zu ihrer ewigen Ruh' nach Zarncke's Übersetzung), *ê die sonne zu gnâden gêt* und *so muoz ich gnâde und ruowe lân* ('Ruhe') nebeneinander stehen, ist es wahrscheinlich dass bei dem theozentrischen Weltbild des Mittelalters der Gnadebegriff nicht alle diese Wendungen farbt? Besonders da wir doch die romanischen Parallelen haben: ich führe noch an span. *estar en la gloria* 'ruhig, zufrieden leben,' *dar la gloria* 'die ewige Seligkeit verschaffen,' *Dios le tenga en su gloria* 'Gott habe ihn selig' (von Verstorbenen), wo die Himmelsglorie (der Glanz) mit Wonne und Ruhe zusammenschmilzt.¹ Ich halte es nicht für realistischer, wenn der Philologe die Realität der mitschwingenden Obertöne eines Wortes ausschaltet.

LEO SPITZER

G ROHLFS (ANS, CLXXIII, 133) On connaît M. G. Rohlfs, professeur de langues romanes à Tübingue, comme excellent explorateur de parlers ruraux, on a noté ensuite certaine *rusticité* dans d'âpres polémiques contre des écoles s'inspirant d'attitudes moins naturalistes, le voilà qui s'embarque dans la *rustre* du racisme. Au lieu cité on trouve les idées suivantes (dans un c-r d'un travail sur la France et le racisme) il faudrait distinguer les Français authentiques et les écrivains juifs, il est singulier de voir le Juif André Suarès énuméré entre Paul Claudel et Charles Péguy, "Si l'on insiste sur le fait que c'était Montaigne qui s'érigea en défenseur des esclaves nègres, il ne fallait pas taire que M. était demi-juif." A part

¹ Ich gebe noch ein romanisches Beispiel aus anderer Sphäre. Restaurants heißen gern auf Frz. *Chez Michaud* warum *chez* 'bei,' wenn nicht die Gemüchlichkeitsnuance von *casa* 'Haus' gewünscht wurde?

la gracieuse supposition d'une collusion entre le nègre et le juif, qui pour rait faire plaisir a M Celine, il est interessant pour un public americain de voir que le fait d'epouser une cause humanitaire trouve chez le chevalier prussien de la civilisation son 'excuse' dans une particularité du sang! Lincoln avait probablement une mere juive!

LEO SPITZER

ROBERT A HALL, JR (*Language*, 14 154) writes a review of von Wartburg's book, *La posizione della lingua italiana nel mondo neolatino* I state briefly the reasons for my fundamental disagreement with Mr Hall

(1) Mr H looks to such unphilosophical minds as Nyrop and Goidanich and to so flexible an intelligence as Sapir for backing in his attack on Humboldt's and Croce's philosophical conceptions of "Sprachgeist und Volksseele" but when Sapir says, "such correlations are rubbish," he means the correlation of particular types of linguistic morphology and certain stages of cultural development (that is why he says, "Plato walks with the Macedonian swineherd"—both of them speak Greek!) This is not v Wartburg's procedure he compares—and Mr H criticizes him for it, unjustifiably, I think—two literary languages, Italian and French, both originating from Latin Sapir himself, generally so skeptical of any correlating of language and culture, must admit (p 227 of his book *Language*) "In an area dominated by the national sentiment there is a tendency of language and culture to become uniform and specific, so that linguistic and cultural boundaries at least tend to coincide" This is precisely what happened in France and Italy at the time of the nationalism of the Renaissance One cannot deny that French and Italian society (grammarians etc) worked out a national set of thoughts, different in the two countries, directing French toward logical rigidity,¹ Italian toward flexibility—characteristic features, I suppose, of the two nations in modern times

(2) Mr H argues from an example supposed to show the nonsense of correlating "Sprachgeist" and "Volksseele" the Hungarians resemble the Italians more than the French (a highly doubtful observation, incidentally¹), although their languages do not show the same proportion of resemblances—but the example does not apply to Mr v Wartburg's procedure because he does not compare remote languages and civilizations, but the offsprings of the common Latin language with a common linguistic patrimonium and closely related to Neo-latin civilizations

(3) Everyone knows that the French and Italians differ in their national character, that their languages differ, and that these differences must be correlated—the scholar may be "cool" (Sapir) but not frigid, he must re-examine the commonplace with his refined categories and

¹ Likewise, the "règle des 24 heures" the French grammarians of the XVIIth century elaborated for the *passé composé* corresponds exactly to the famous unity of time on the French stage

methods A historian of French literature as positivistic as Lanson begins his standard book with a chapter on the "caractères de la race"—why should the historian of language operate in a vacuum? It is significant indeed that Meillet, the outspoken representative of the Saussurean linguistics of "lois générales," became in his last days an adherent of Croceanism and Vosslerism (G Ivănescu pointed this out in "Buletinul Philippide," 1937, p 228) I myself heard him at the Linguistic Congress at the Hague in 1928 oppose the rigid mind of the Turks, as expressed in their thinking and language, to the flexibility of Indo-European thought and language

(4) Mr H qualifies the aesthetic approach to language as subjective The charge of subjectivity by scholars very often is no more than an assumption that their own procedure is objective and that that of their opponents is subjective (are not some of Mr H's etymologies very "subjective," indeed "impressionistic"?) I do not understand how an un-aesthetic or "anaesthetized" approach to language, which is *also* an aesthetic phenomenon, can ever reach an approximate understanding of its nature The means of investigation must somehow be congruent with the subject matter under investigation can a nothing-but-philologist deal with mathematics?

(5) As for the "standstill in Italian linguistics" which seems to Mr H the result of Crocean influence, I, who leveled the same criticism some years ago (Indogerm Forsch L [1932], 148 seq), would hesitate today to endorse my former statement since that time such men as Migliorini, Schiaffini, Bertoni, Tagliavini, Prati, Maccarrone, Bottiglioni have done excellent work in the field of the history of Italian, especially Schiaffini's history of Old Florentine prose which combines aesthetic judgment with linguistic craftsmanship, and Migliorini's studies of modern Italian word-formation as an expression of modern civilization are unequalled in Romance philology The relative standstill was due not to Croceanism but precisely to the traditionalism of the Goidanich-Merlo school which knew how to curry favor with the government by shouting the slogan "Ascoli"

(6) I do not see what contradiction in terms may lie in the expression "le diverse scienze dello spirito" there is one human mind with several manifestations, in different peoples and in different subject matters, the various fields of philology and of history, history of art, music, literature, law, economics, all contribute to the *scienza nuova* or Geistesgeschichte drafted by Vico, Herder, Humboldt The self-sufficiency of linguistics advocated by Mr. Hall is the surest way of destroying its scientific character

LEO SPITZER

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIV

APRIL, 1939

Number 4

ROBERT HENRYSON AND THE FULGENTIAN HORSE

In his *Testament of Cresseid*, Henryson devotes a stanza to a description of the four horses of the sun. Recent editors of Henryson, although they agree that the names of the sun's horses derive from Ovid, disagree specifically concerning the spelling of the fourth horse's name. In the light of new evidence, I venture to suggest that this disagreement may be resolved, the correct text established, and Henryson's source located.

The stanza in question is as follows (ll 211-217)

The first was soyr, with Mane als reid as Rois,
Callit Eoye into the Orient,
The second steid to Name hecht Ethios,
Quhitlie and paill, and sum deill ascendent,
The third Peros, richt hart and richt fervent,
The feird was blak, callit Philologie
Quhilk rollis Phebus down into the sey¹

Comment on this passage is largely concerned with the spelling of the word, *Philologie*, in an attempt to restore order among the confusion of various preceding forms.² The first discussion of the

¹ H. H. Wood, *Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson* (Edinburgh, 1933), p. 112

² Henryson's text is based upon two early editions that presumably drew from a lost original. They are William Thynne's *Chaucer* (London, 1532), and the *Testament of Cresseid*, edited by Henry Charteris (Edinburgh, 1593). The former gives the spelling *Philologiee*, the latter *Philologie*.

The confusion among the texts of early editors may be briefly indicated by Sibbald's spelling of *Phlegone*, and Laing's spelling of *Phlegome*. See J. Sibbald, *Chronicle of Scottish Poetry*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh 1802), and D. Laing, *Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson* (Edinburgh, 1865). These forms are incorporated in the text without comment.

question occurs in Skeat, who adopts the spelling *Phlegoney*. His comment on the passage is as follows.

The names of the four horses are curiously corrupted from the names given in Ovid, *Met* 11, 153, viz Eous, Aethon, Pyroeis, and Phlegon. As *Eous* means 'belonging to the dawn,' we may consider the words *into the Orient*, i. e. in the East, as explanatory of the name *Eoy*, 'called Eoy, (which signifies) in the East'. As to the name of the last horse, it was obviously meant to take the form *Phlegoney*, in order to rhyme with *sey* (sea), and I have therefore restored this form. The two authorities give it in the amazing form *Philologie* (*Philologiee*), which can only mean 'philology'.²

Smith prefers the spelling *Phlegonie*, commenting as follows

The names of the four steeds of the Sun are drawn, with some latitude in spelling, from Ovid, *Met*, 11, 153-155 —

"Interea volucres Pyroeis, et Eous, et Aethon,
Solis equi, quantusque Phlegon, hinnitus auras
Flammiferis implent pedibusque repagula pulsant"

The last (Phlegon) appears in both texts in the quaint form *Philologie* or *Philologiee*. Skeat reconstructs the line—

"The feird was blak callit Phlegoney",

but it seems better to read thus—

"The feird was blak (and) callit Phlegonie"³

Wood returns to one of the two original spellings, *Philologie*, apparently under a misconception, commenting as follows

The names of the four steeds derive from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In both *Charteris* and *Thynne*, *Phlegon* appears as *Philologiee*. *K* and *SJ* give the correct reading.⁴

Dickins uses the spelling of Skeat, stating in his glossary,

Phlegoney, Phlegon (Ovid, *Met* 11, 154), an obvious correction of the *Charteris Philologie* and *Thynne's Philologiee*.⁵

² W. W. Skeat, *Chaucerian and Other Pieces* (Oxford, 1897), p. 523.

³ G. G. Smith, *Poems of Robert Henryson*, STS, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1906-14), 1, 48.

⁴ H. H. Wood, *op cit*, p. 256. The misconception derives from the fact that both *Charteris* and *Thynne* do not give the same spelling. See above, note 2. *K* stands for Kinaston who edited the poem *circa* 1640. *SJ* refers to an undated MS in St John's College, Cambridge. Both of these texts, however, are late, and accordingly of secondary importance.

⁵ B. Dickins, *The Testament of Cresseid* (Edinburgh, 1925), p. 38.

Apparently Henryson's editors were unaware of the fact that the various traditions of the sun's horses, long established in Greek literature,⁷ may be found to resolve themselves into two main streams in the Middle Ages. For lack of precedent, I have arbitrarily labeled them the Ovidian and the Fulgentian. Modern scholarship, it may be noted, has in general erred in emphasizing the former and ignoring the latter.⁸ The traditions vary in presenting different names for the four horses, and a different set of individual characteristics for each horse. Since Ovid, alone, does not give individual characteristics for each horse, although his followers do, I am illustrating the Ovidian tradition by the *Ovide Moralisé*. In this work, the sun's horses are described thus (II, 292-296).

Pirouz, qui rouges a le poil
A droite samblance de fu
Et Eouz, qui blanc refu,
Ethon, cui resplent la colour,
Et Phlegon, plains de grant chalour °

This Ovidian version is further consistently followed by Borchorius,¹⁰ Froissart,¹¹ and, in part, by Lydgate¹² and Chaucer.¹³ On the other hand, Fulgentius writes of the same four horses as follows

Unde & ipsius equis condigna sic nomina posuerunt, id est Erythreus, Actaeon, Lampos, Philogeus. Erythreus Graece rubeus dicitur, quod à

⁷ See W. H. Roscher, *Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1886-90), under *Helios* and *Phaeton*.

⁸ "Ovids glänzende Darstellung der Sage ist fast für alle späteren Dichter massgebend gewesen. Auch die mythographische Litteratur ist fast ganz durch Ovid beeinflusst." See Roscher, *op. cit.*, under *Phaeton*.

We may anticipate this exposition in order to observe how misleading such statements are in the light of the fact that the poets Gower and Henryson utilize a version other than the Ovidian, either in whole or in part, as well as the mythographers Fulgentius, Hyginus, the three Vatican Mythographers, and Pseudo-Bede. See below, p. 4.

⁹ Ed. de Boer, *Koninklijke Akademie*, xxx, No. 3 (Amsterdam, 1931).

¹⁰ *Opera Omnia* (am Hoff, 1712), I, 400.

¹¹ *La Prison Amoureuse*, I, 272, in *Oeuvres de Froissart*, ed. M. A. Scheler (Brussels, 1870).

¹² *Troy Book*, ed. H. Bergen, *EEES* (London, 1906), I, 623, 626-9, II, 2386-7, III, 9-10.

¹³ *Troilus and Criseyde*, III, 1703-4.

matutino Sol lumine rubicundus exsurgat Actaeon splendens dicitur, quod tertiae horae [momentis] vehemens insistsens lucidior fulgeat Lampos vero ardens, dum ad umbilicum diei centratum conscendeit circulum Philogeus Graece terram amans dicitur, quod hora nona proclivior, vergens occasibus pronus incumbat¹⁴

This Fulgentian version is even more consistently followed by the three Vatican Mythographers¹⁵ and Gower¹⁶ In order to make these two contrasting traditions available for consideration, I have appended a short outline at the conclusion of this paper, designed to bring out the differences, and at the same time, the widespread dissemination of these traditions

Both traditions are found, however, with significant minor variations, in a popular work of the ninth century entitled *De Mundi Coelestis Terrestrisque Constitutione Liber*, by Pseudo-Bede¹⁷ In this work, the horses of the sun are described as follows:

Sol secundum poetas dicitur in curru vehi quem trahunt equi, quorum haec sunt nomina, secundum Fulgentium Primus, Erythros, id est, rubens, quia mane sol rubet Secundus Acteon, id est, splendens, quia circa tertia clarius lucet Tertius Lampon, id est, ardens, nam in meridie est fervidissimus Quartus Philoges, id est, amans terram, nam nobis occidendo videtur appropriare

Sed secundum Ovidium habet alia haec nomina Eous, id est, oriens, vel surgens Aethon, id est, elatus Pyrois, id est, igneus Phlegon, id est, acclivis, quia primum sol surgit, dehinc elevatur, postea fervet, in fine autem diei inclinatur ad occasum

It may be stated at once that the evidence points to this passage as Henryson's probable source. If an intermediate version exists, it has not been found.¹⁸

¹⁴ *Mythologicon*, p. 638, in *Auctores Mythographi Latini*, ed. A. van Staveren (Lugd. Bat. Amstelaed, 1742)

¹⁵ These three authors have been edited together by H. B. Bode, in *Scriptores Rerum Mythicarum* (Cellis, 1834), pp. 36, 81, 202

¹⁶ *Confessio Amantis*, VII, 853-7, in *Poems of Thomas Gower*, ed. G. C. Macaulay (Oxford, 1899) See also J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XC, 1154, for another appearance of the Fulgentian version

¹⁷ J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XC, 900 See P. Duhem, *Le Système du Monde* (Paris, 1913-17), III, 76 ff. See also, J. L. E. Dreyer, *Mediaeval Astronomy, in Studies in the History and Method of Science*, ed. C. Singer (Oxford, 1921), II, 106, C. W. Jones, *A Note on Concepts of the Inferior Planets in the Middle Ages*, in *Iris* (February, 1936), XXIV, 397-9

¹⁸ As might be expected, descriptions of the sun's horses are found, if at all, among the writers who deal with mythology Early allusions to horses

The case for Henryson's obligation to this passage may be briefly indicated. Only in the second paragraph of the above quotation, referring to the sun's horses *secundum Ovidum*, are the horses named in the exact order found in Henryson. This fundamental similarity may be found in no other version. Again, an unique parallel may be found in the individual characteristics of two of the horses. Thus, Henryson's first horse, "Callit Eoye, into the Orient," finds a precedent in the *Eous, id est, oriens* of Pseudo-Bede. Likewise, both versions agree as to the second horse. Henryson's "Peros, richt hart and richt fervent," duplicates to the extent of an almost identical spelling the *igneus . . . postea fervet* of Pseudo-Bede. A further possibility occurs in the parallel of Henryson's "sum deill ascendent," to the *elatus . . . dehinc elevatur* of this passage. It should be repeated that these resemblances occur only in the *De Mundi*, and moreover, only in this work are they applied to the identical horses. The most interesting possibility of Henryson's debt to Pseudo-Bede, however, remains to be briefly mentioned.

Returning to the spelling of the fourth horse's name, with which, as we have seen, the editors of Henryson have been particularly concerned, it becomes evident in the light of the two traditions, that the spelling of *Philologie* or *Philologee* in Henryson's text, derives from the Fulgentian spelling of *Philoges*, rather than the Ovidian form of *Phlegon*. On this point, the exigencies of riming may be invoked, just as Skeat invoked them. For the form *Philoges* adapts

consist of Virgil's *Aethon* (*Aeneid*, xi, 89), Martial's *Aethonem* and *Xanthum* (viii, *Ep* 21), and the *Pyroenta* of Valerius Flaccus (*Argonautica*, v, 32). In later times, Hyginus offers a rare third version that had no discernible influence (van Staveren, *op cit*, pp 302-3). See also table at the end of this study), Lactantius Placidus parrots Ovid's names *verbatim* (*Idem*, p 795), while Martianus Capella and Albricus Philosphus make no mention of the sun's horses whatsoever.

I should like to add, for the benefit of future investigators, that I have been unable to find any descriptions of the sun's horses, for example, among such widely divergent groups as astronomers, astrologers, and patristic writers. Among the works examined, I may mention the astronomical writings of Manilius, Ptolemy, and Firmicus, the astrological writings of Albohazen, Alchabitus, Almansor, and Messala, and the patristic writings contained in Migne's great edition, among others. Further, the works of the encyclopedist, Vincent de Beauvais, offered nothing on this point.

itself, both in its number of syllables and its potential end-rime to Henryson's immediate purposes, far better than *Phlegon*, the form into which his editors have attempted to force the text. The conclusion seems possible that Henryson, with Pseudo-Bede's *De Mundi* open before him, rejected the Ovidian spelling and went back a few lines to the Fulgentian form. This suggestion would at the same time explain the mixture of the two traditions in Henryson and fix the source for the entire passage.

In the light of the evidence briefly outlined, which may not be further elaborated in this short note, it appears reasonable to abandon attempts to emend Henryson's text in this instance, and to allow the names of the four horses of the sun to stand as they originally appeared.¹⁹

PRECEDENTS FOR HENRYSON'S FOUR HORSES OF THE SUN

<i>Ovidian</i>		<i>Fulgentian</i>		
1 <i>Ovid</i>		1 <i>Fulgentius</i>		
Pyrois, Eous, Aethon, Phlegon		Erythreus	rubeus	matutino
		Actaeon	splendens	tertius
11 <i>Bede</i> (in part)		hora		
Eous . oriens vel surgens		Lamos	ardens	umbilicum
Aethon . elatus . elevatur		diei		
Pyrois . igneus fervet		Philogeus	terram amans, hora	
Phlegon . acclivis		nona		
111 <i>Lactantius Placidus</i>		11 <i>Bede</i> (in part)		
Pyrois, Eous, Aethon, Phlegon		Erythros	rubeus	mane

¹⁹ Parenthetically, an interesting speculation arises in connection with the analogy of the sun's horses to the four periods of the day. Did these mediaeval authors conceive of the four horses as running four abreast or in relay? Henryson, for example, says "Philologie, quhilk rollis Phebus down into the sey." The inference is justified that *Philologie* did this work alone. The solution seems to be that in the mediaeval search for symbolic analogy, the sun's horses accumulated such a wealth of individual characteristics, that they appeared to work in relay, although paradoxically, the writers never thought of them other than as four-abreast. This conclusion is reinforced by Ovid, who clearly writes of the team as four-abreast (See *Metamorphoses*, II, 1 ff). Likewise, the iconography of the sun's horses points to the same conclusion. See B. A. Fuchs, *Die Ikonographie der 7 Planeten* (Munich, 1909), plates II and III, and A. Frey-Sallmann, *Aus dem Nachleben antiker Gottergestalten* (Leipzig, 1931), plates X and XI.

<i>Ovidian</i>	<i>Fulgentian</i>
iv <i>Ovide Moralisé</i> ²⁰	Acteon splendens circa ter-
Pirouz rouges fu	tiam
Eouz blanc	Lampon ardens meridie
Ethon resplendit la colour	Philoges amans terram . . . occi-
Phlegon grant chalour	dendo
v <i>Berchorius</i>	iii <i>Bede</i> (2)
Aethon rubeus	Erytheus rubeus
Eous splendens	Acteus splendens
Pyrois ardens	Lampas ardens
Phlegon urens terram	Philogeus amans terram
vi <i>Froussart</i>	iv <i>Myth Vat I</i>
Pirrous rouge	Erythraeus rubeus matutino
Eous blans com neje	Aethon splendens
Ethon	Lampus ardens
Phlegon calour	Philogeus terram amans
vii <i>Lydgate</i>	vespere
Pirous so rede	v <i>Myth Vat II</i>
Pirrous up drawe	Erythraeus rubeus matutino
Flegonte	Aethon splendens tertia hora
vii <i>Chaucer</i>	Lampus ardens summum
Pirous	diei
	Philogeus terrae amans nona
	hora
	vi <i>Myth Vat III</i>
	Erythraeus rubens mane
	Aethon splendens hora tertia
	Lampus lucens, ardens die
	media
	Philogeus amans tertiā
	occidendo
	vii <i>Gower</i>
	Eritheus hote red
	Acteos the bryhte
	Lampes
	Philogeus

Early Forms Homer's *Lampum*, *Phaethontem*, Virgil's *Aethon*, Mar-
tial's *Aethonem*, *Xanthum*, Valerius Flaccus' *Pyroenta*

Yale University

MARSHALL W. STEARNS

²⁰ For variant spellings in the prose versions of the *Ovide Moralisé*, see
U D Hunt, *Le Sommaire en Prose* (Paris, 1925), p 10

MS SLOANE 3548, FOLIO 158

The leaf from a medieval catalogue of books which is folio 158 in MS Sloane 3548 in the British Museum, is paper without watermark. There is no inscription or other external evidence of its history. There is no medieval folio mark. The hand is English and fifteenth century, and MS Sloane 3548, a fifteenth century book, is the entry at lines 31-2 in the following transcript. The owners' names are English¹ and many texts are of English origin². Marginal marks indicate fifty entries. Where the word *item* occurs in the text it may not begin a new entry since the *Practica Johannis Ardern* in MS Sloane 3548 is catalogued as an *item*, possibly it was regarded as a second part of the volume, for it is earlier than the texts that precede it. The note, *Liber Roberti Maycotte*, on the first page of the *Practica*, folio 26, was probably there before this text was bound up in the Sloane MS. Any entry said to be *in uno quaterno* may, like the Sloane MS, be a volume. Only about a dozen entries are said to be *in uno volumine* or *in uno libro*, and all the rest are *in uno quaterno*. In line 7 this phrase, if it is compared with *in volumine ligato* in lines 8 and 9, seems to imply that the *quaternus* is not bound, but the binding of a *quaternus* is sometimes mentioned or referred to as in *in uno parvo quaterno cum nigro opertorio* (l. 34), and *in uno magno hirsuto quaterno* (l. 21). In *Item vj quaterni Alberti de animalibus* (ll. 79-80), *quaternus* means *liber* since the *Animalia* is in six books, and most medieval cataloguers would have used *tractatus* rather than *quaternus* in *quaternus de cura equorum* (l. 65), so that *Item vj quaterni de medicinis* (l. 24) may be a treatise in three books or three treatises, and the *Item vj quaterni de transitu ad Jerusalem* (ll. 76-7) is in two books, like Mandeville's *Travels*.

The syntax is lost at times, as in *Isidorus de creaturarum* (l. 49), and the order of the text is not always unmistakable, for example, *Item Hugo de consciencia* (l. 4) is appended to the completed description of a volume. After *North'* (l. 68) there was no room for *scilicet sancti Jacobi North'* (l. 69), it was written below but immediately after the entry in the next line and as an emendation to

¹ See the note to line 48 of the text.

² See the index to the text in notes 3 and 4.

the text, as if it had been taken over carelessly from another draft of the catalogue. More often than not the author's name is omitted.³ The anonymous titles include much theology and science and some literature.⁴ Some titles are unusual, for example, *Liber nemroth* (1 79), possibly a work in French beginning "Nemroth." The chronicle entitled *de adventu Normannorum in Angliam* (1. 27) may be the text of this title in MS Bodl 712 (S C 2619) or the Cluniac chronicle in MS Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 433. The *Milk et breed* (1 25) occurs with texts commonly with Chaucer's *Astrolabe*, and the *Astrolabe* is called *Bred and milk for children* in some of the manuscripts, but this copy is apparently not any known manuscript.⁵

³ Authors mentioned are Albertus Magnus (1 80), Alred of Rievaulx (20-1), Augustine of Hippo (5-6, 36, 40-1, 44, 53, 61, 75), Bartholomeus Brixiensis (66), Bernard of Clairvaux (12, 41, 83), Galen (22), Gregory the Great (56, 64), Hugo de St Victore (4), Isidore of Seville (49), Jerome (46), John Ardein (32), John Belet (43), John Ruysbroek (18), Lanfranc (23), Macer (33), Martinus Polonus (28), Mesue (31), Nicholas medicus (30), Nicholas de Lyra (57), Nicholas Trivet (12), Otho (58), Petrus Alphonsus (58), Peter of Blois (72), Peter of Cluny (10-1, 43), Peter Comestor (3, 20), Richard Hampole (14), Richard de St Victore (5), Robert Holcote (55), Thomas Bonaventura (18-9), Vincent of Beauvais (27), Walter Hilton (17, 40, 76), Willelmus Parisiensis or de Alvernia (1), and William de Montibus (79). Some authors not mentioned are Robert Grosseteste (35), John Chrysostom (17), Palladius (65), John Gadsden (29), and Chaucer (25).

⁴ Theology (17, 37-8, 43-4, 52-3, 72), ethics (12, 13, 44), penitentials (35, 38-9), the church (16, 58, 80), prayers (4, 31, 82), sermons (19, 77, 80-1), concordances or anthologies (2, 42), Biblical commentary (20, 50, 52), astronomy (16, 25-6, 68-9, 71, 78), calendars (20, 50, 52), mathematics (15, 54), alchemy (70), lapidary (33), husbandry (65), medicine (15, 22-5, 29, 31, 33, 51, 59, 75, 79, 81), verse (4, 60, 82), narrative (3, 48, 62, 72, 76-7, 82), saints' lives (3, 7-11, 46-7), vision (60, 72-3), prophecy (16, 81), dialogue (61), history (27).

⁵ The manuscripts called *Bred and milk* are Bodl 619 (S C 2151), E Museo 54 (S C 3554), and Bodl 68 (S C 2142). The others are at Oxford, E Museo 116 (S C 3617), Digby 72, Ashmole 360, 391, 393, and Rawlinson Misc 3 and 1370 (MSS 29 and 291 among the quartos in Thomas Rawlinson's sale catalogue by Thomas Ballard, March, 1733-4); at Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 424, St John's College, 105 (E2), Trinity College, R 15 18 (941), University Library, Dd 3 53, and Dd 12 51, in the British Museum, Add 23002 (MS 27 in the sale catalogue of Dr Cox Macro by Christie, 1820, MS 314 in the sale of Dawson Turner by Puttick and Simpson, 1859), Add 29250, Egerton 2622 (probably MS 349 in the

Nothing is known of the history of the Sloane MS. Neither Maycotte nor any of the former owners mentioned in the catalogue is readily found in the records.⁶ The book of *North' scilicet sancti Jacobi North'* belonged presumably to the Augustinian abbey of St. James, Northampton.⁷ The catalogue can hardly be from an Augustinian house, for the *Vita sancti Benedicti* (l. 10) is only rarely in catalogues of English Benedictine houses and not at all in the extant Augustinian catalogues, while the works of Peter of Cluny, of which this house had two texts, were customarily owned by Benedictine—or Cistercian, Carthusian, or Cluniac—houses. If *North'* is Northampton, then the Sloane MS is probably—though by no means certainly—from a house of the Benedictine order or

sale catalogue of Sir Joseph Jekyll by Cock, January 21, 1740, as this MS contained, besides the *Astrolabe*, *Varia opuscula* of Robert Grosseteste, and the *de sphaera* of John de Sacro Bosco *cum multis aliis*, Sloane 261, 314 (MS 73 in the sale catalogue of the duke of Lauderdale by John Bullord, January 25, 1691-2), and 446, Brussels 4869 (1591?), Philipps 11955 (MS 837 in the sale catalogue of Joseph Ames by Langford, 1760, MS 955 in the sale catalogue of Sir Peter Thompson by Evans, 1815, MS 188 in the Philipps sale, June 6, 1898, to Quaritch, MS 65 in the Quaritch catalogue, no 193, 1899), MS Ashburnham (MS 924 in the sale catalogue of Edmund F. Bourke by Evans, July, 1831, to Cochran, MS 210 in the sale of George Wilkinson by Evans, July 11, 1836, to Pickering, MS 71 in the Appendix to the Ashburnham catalogue, May 1, 1899, to Leighton, MS 438 in the George Dunn catalogue, part I, 1913, to Maggs, MS 30 in the Maggs catalogue, no 308, 1913), MS 72 in the Sotheby catalogue, November 12, 1928, Sir Hercules Read, MS Clarendon, not known to be extant, no 3 among the *Libri Math.* in the *Tenisoniana et Dugdaleana* (1692), and in Edward Bernard's *Catalogi librorum MSS Anglie et Hibernie* (1697), a quarto containing also *Temporum prognostica* in English and *Vita S. Willelmi* and *Epigrammata Ricardi de Snetesham* in Latin, and MS 423 in the sale catalogue of Henry Brouncker Willson by Gerard, 1790, to Simcoe, a "MS on Geomancy with Chaucer's *Astrolabe* on paper," not known now unless it is the manuscript in the library of the duke of Northumberland described by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, III, 111, as the "Bibill of Geomancy in English with a treatise of the *Astrolabe*." The MS mentioned by Miss Hammond as among the Hatton manuscripts may be one of the E Museo manuscripts. The Boies Penrose MS is the Read MS.

⁶ Maycotte seems too early to be the executor of John Roper of Eltham, *Letters and papers of Henry VIII*, IV, part I, no 72 (1524).

⁷ If the house were the hospital of St. James, Northallerton, the book mentioned here would be said to be *sancti Jacobi de Alverstone*, according to the inscription on the seal of the house, *Victoria County History*, Yorkshire, III, 317.

one of its branches in or near Northampton. St. Andrew's, Northampton is the most likely house. It seems to have had a classified library, for one of the extant books, MS. Bodl. Auct. D. I. 8 (S. C. 2761), is marked E. 3. A cell to the Cluniac house of St. Mary, La Charité-sur-Loire, St. Andrew's, like other alien priories, suffered heavy depredation during the French wars. In 1386 the abbot of St. James's and others were commissioned to examine the losses of the priory.⁸ Peter of Cluny addressed one of his letters to St. Andrew's.⁹ St. James's had a good small library, according to the *Registrum doctorum Anglie* or Franciscan catalogue,¹⁰ and has been conjectured to be the source of MS Royal 8 F X in the British Museum because of the title, *Cantuariensis super Job*, which is also in MS Oriel College, Oxford, 53, a book of St. Andrew's, Northampton, but the books listed in the Royal MS as borrowed by John de Haliwell (c. 1300) include the *Bibliotheca Roberti de Daventria*, a Ramsey abbey book,¹¹ and John de Haliwell is a Ramsey name, the name of an almoner of Henry VIII's time¹² and of a witness to the Ramsey charter, MS Add. 33047 in the British Museum, which is late thirteenth century. The Carmelite friar who is mentioned twice in the Sloane fragment (ll. 51, 70) may be one of the Northampton Carmelites. Little is known of English Cluniac libraries. The fragmentary catalogue in MS Bodl. 751 (S. C. 2518) has been ascribed to Bermondsey.¹³ It lists the *Consuetudinarium Cluniacense* but is not necessarily Cluniac on that account as some Benedictine houses, Reading and Peterborough, for instance,¹⁴ had this text. The *Vite quatuor abbatum de Cluniaco*

⁸ *Calendar of the patent rolls of Richard II* (1385-9), p. 168, another record of depredation mentions books, *Calendar of entries in the papal registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Papal Letters*, IV, 454.

⁹ *Victoria County History*, Northamptonshire, II, 103.

¹⁰ MS Tanner 165 from a photostat copy which I have by courtesy of the Bodleian Library (see note 1 to the text of the Sloane fragment below). There are about thirty entries from St. James's, five from Titchfield, a library of about 200 volumes, fifteen from Lanthony where there were about 450, and about 280 from Christ Church, Canterbury where there were more than 1800.

¹¹ *Chronicon abbatiae Ramesiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray (London, 1886), pp. 356-67.

¹² MS Cotton Julius F IX (British Museum), f. 1.

¹³ N. Denholm-Young, *English Historical Review*, XLVIII (1933), 431.

¹⁴ In the Reading catalogue among the service books at the end, *English*

likewise does not prove the anonymous catalogue in MS Harley 50 (British Museum) to be from a Cluniac house, for Christ Church, Canterbury had a copy of the *Vite*.¹⁵ MS Harley 50 seems to be from the north of England as there is a contemporary note on the verso of the catalogue that the Nevilles and the Percys fought in 1454 *in agro juxta Catton*, perhaps near Topcliffe and pretty certainly in the region of the other battles between Nevilles and Percys at Beverley, Stamford Bridge, Castleton, and Towton. The house, if Cluniac, is likely to be Pontefract, if Benedictine, St Mary's, York. In the *Registrum doctorum Anglie* Lewes library appears as one of the greater libraries, about five times the size of Lenton and about ten times the size of Clifford and Farley, cells to Lewes, while the other Cluniac libraries, Castleacre, Montacute, St Andrew's, Northampton, and Thetford, appear as small or negligible. There were 130 books at Farley when an inventory of the priory goods was made in 11 Edward III.

vj libros [] vnde ij passionaria iij omelaria et j librum qui
vocalur vitas patrum precii xl s Item j portiphorium precii toto
x s Cxxx libros in libria quorum nomina continentur in vna
tabula ibidem et de eorum precio ignoratur¹⁶

No list of Farley books is known to be on record in modern times.

In the following transcript of the Sloane fragment the spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and arrangement of the original are retained as far as possible. Some marks of punctuation are recorded in the notes. All periods are included whether with abbreviations or not, as no system is apparent. Brackets indicate cancelled matter and additions by a second hand. Where a letter appears in several different large forms only the form used at the beginning of an entry is taken to be the capital.¹

Historical Review, ix (1888), 113 ff, and MS 12 O in the Peterborough catalogue, M R James, *List of manuscripts formerly in Peterborough abbey library*, *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, v (Oxford, 1926)

¹⁵ MS Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 161

¹⁶ An indenture between Thomas de Knaresburgh, clerk, and Gilbert de Berewyk, sheriff of Wiltshire, C47/18/1/17. It is not dated, the date is inferred from other indentures in C47/18/1 and from Berewyk's term as sheriff.

¹ Transcribed from the original and checked with a photostat copy which I have by courtesy of the British Museum, one of a collection purchased out of the stipend of the Alice Freeman Palmer Memorial Fellowship, the

- Parisiensis de vicij et virtutibus in ij voluminibus ligatis ²
 Distincciones in theologia ³ vsque ad capitulum leuis vel leuitas in
 quaterno
 Narraciones deuote ⁴ magister historiariū ⁵ abbreviatus Narraciones
 de vij sapientibus ⁶
 Jtem officium sancte trinitatis metrice in vno quaterno Jtem hugo
 de consciencia
 5 Ricardus de sancto victore de potestate ligandi atque soluendi Sermo
 sancti Augustini de
 castitate Jtem soliloquia eiusdem in vno quaterno
 Reuelaciones sancte Matildis in vno quaterno
 Reuelaciones sancte Katerine de Senys in j volumine ligato
 Reuelaciones sancte Brigide in vno volumine ligato
 10 Vita sancti benedicti Vite diuersorum patrum Vita sancti Wlfrici
 Vita sancti Godrici Nar-
 raciones petri cluniacensis ⁷ et plura alia in ix quaternis papiri fis
 stephani martyris ⁸
 Quaternus nicholai tiiuet Meditationes bernardi libellus de modo
 viuendi ⁹ Quedam
 summa de vicij capitalibus ¹⁰ Tractatus de x mandatis Speculum
 peccatoris ¹¹ [] ¹²
 Jtem xij capitula ricardi hampole in vno quaterno —
 15 Algorismus De diuinatione demonum ¹³ de blasfemia in spiritum
 sanctum Medicine Compotus
 Theorica planetarum Indulgentie romane Prophecia scilicet versus
 bridlyngton' in j quaterno

American Association of University Women, 1933 4, to be deposited in an American library as the gift of the Fellowship

² In the scribe's hand but slightly larger, as in *libro*, etc, in line 30 and in *Statuta*, etc, in line 58 As to the period after *voluminibus*, compare line 8

³ Commonly *Distinctiones theologie* or *theologie*

⁴ Possibly *Narraciones deuote de domina nostra*

⁵ Peter Comestor

⁶ Commonly *Historia* or *Dicta*

⁷ Probably the *Miracula corporis Christi*

⁸ MS fis stephī mris If the catalogue is from a Cluniac house, it may be significant that in the Cluniac chronicle in MS Corpus Christi College Cambridge, 433, at the year 1061 is *Incepit locus S Marie de Carit Stephani*

⁹ Perhaps Bernard's *de modo bene viuendi*

¹⁰ This and the next may be by Robert Grosseteste

¹¹ Ascribed to Augustine, Bernard, Cesarius Arelatensis, and Rolle

¹² MS *in t*, crossed out

¹³ This and the next may be by Augustine

- Epistola W Hilton' De ij generibus inclusionis Nemo leditur¹⁴
 nisi a seipso
 libri Johannis Rosbiuk¹⁵ Jtinerarium thome bonaventure Jtem de
 itineribus eternitatis
 secundum eundem Sermo ductus est ihesus in desertum in vno quaterno
 20 Kalendaria¹⁶ Allegoria¹⁷ historiarum secundum magistrum petrum
 Figuraciones historiarum generalium¹⁸ Alredus
 de amicicia in vno magno hirsuto quaterno —
 Anathomia galieni Quateinus de coloribus phisice Alfabetum
 herbarum¹⁹ Quid
 pro quo²⁰ Lamfrancus Tractatus de arte sirurgie De aquis tingentibus
 diuersos colores
 Secretum philosophorum²¹ Jtem ij quaterni de medicinis in j
 quaterno —
 25 Milk et breed²¹ De naturis planetarum²² Due composiciones nauis²³
 De xij signis²⁴ Com-
 posicio astrolabi²⁵ Tractatus de spera²⁶ in vno quaterno —
 De adventu normannoium in anglia²⁷ Jtem alia vincenc' in speculo
 historiali Jtem cronica
 martini de pontificibus et imperatoribus in vno quaterno
 Rosa medicine²⁸ cum alijs in vno volumine ligato

¹⁴ MS long r, not y, in *leditur* Probably by John Chrysostom

¹⁵ Probably Ruysbroek's *de ornatu spiritualium nuptiarum*, in MSS Royal 6 B IX and Worcester Cath F80, and in the Syon monastery catalogue, M20 and N87 (Cambridge, 1898), ed Mary Bateson

¹⁶ MS *Kalendar'*, as in l 47

¹⁷ Commonly *Allegorie*

¹⁸ MS *hutor'*, as in l 20, and *gen'*

¹⁹ Also in l 59

²⁰ A list of drugs to be used for rarer drugs, for the full title see MSS Ashmole 399, 1397, 1398

²¹ Chaucer's *Astrolabe*

²² With Chaucer's *Astrolabe* in MS Ashmole 360

²³ MS *nauis* is crossed out in *nauis* With the *Astrolabe* in MSS Add 23002 and Egerton 2622 is *Composicio navicule*, but a *Practica de composicione navis, quadrantis, et cylindri* is ascribed to John de Slape

²⁴ With the *Astrolabe* in MS Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 424 is *Compendium de existencia lune in signis*

²⁵ With the *Astrolabe* in MS Bodl 68 is *ad faciendum astrolabium* A *Composicio Astrolabi* occurs with the Slape text cited in note 23

²⁶ With the *Astrolabe* in MSS Trinity College, Cambridge, 941 and Egerton 2622

²⁷ Perhaps the chronicle of this title in MS Bodl 712 or the Cluniac chronicle in MS Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 433

²⁸ Probably by John Gadsden.

- 30 Antidotarius nicholai cum nominali herbarum ³⁰ et alijs in vno [] ³⁰
 libro nigro ligato
 Oraciones pro quolibet psalmo ³¹ Medicine Mesue ³² Alie medicine ³³ a
 capite ad pedes Jtem
 practica Johannis Ardren' ³⁴ in vno quaterno —
 Lapidarius Macer de virtute herbarum Jtem alijs quatuor quaterni
 de alijs medici-
 nis in vno paruo quaterno cum nigro opertorio Jtem ijs quaterni cum
 alijs friuolis —
- 35 Inquisicio confessorum in confessione De manducacione corporis
 christi Templum domini ³⁵ Enche-
 ridion augustini Vita trium virginum scilicet Elizabeth cristine et
 Marie Oegenes
 Littere quedam de vita sancte Katerine de Senys [] ³⁶ Jtem, de
 ordi-
 nibus angelorum ³⁷ Summa de virtutibus De modo confitendi Jtem
 penitencie de
 iure litate ³⁸ pro diuersis criminibus in vno albo quaterno in quo ³⁹
 fuit omnigedrium —
- 40 Libri ⁴⁰ W Hilton' in latino Incendium amoris Sermones ad fratres
 in heremo ⁴¹ Au-
 gustinus de cognicione ⁴² vere vite Bernardus ad fratres de monte
 dei in j quaterno ligato
 Summe abbreviate et tabula super veritates theologie in j albo
 quaterno —
 Tractatus magistri bylet de officio misse ⁴³ Epistola abbatis clunia-
 censis ⁴⁴ Tractatus

³⁰ In MS Sloane 282 is *Synonyma de nominibus herbarum* by John Bray

³¹ MS *quaterno*, crossed out, as to *libro*, cf note 2

³² MS Sloane 3548, folios 1-6 ³³ MS Sloane 3548, folios 8-10

³⁴ After *medicme* is a horizontal slanting line and *a* follows, touching the line

³⁵ MS Sloane 3548, folios 26-99 The MS contains also chemical notes, 16-17 c, ff 16-22^v, 25, alchemical, 15 c, ff. 109-13, *Synonyma herbarum*, ff 119-25, 129-45, 157, *Legend of St Bride*, f 118

³⁶ Probably by Grosseteste

³⁷ MS *in vno quaterno*, crossed out

³⁸ MS *anglorum*

³⁹ MS *litate*, possibly *limitate*

⁴⁰ MS a line through *in quo* (= *q^o*)

⁴¹ MS *Lib'* With this line begins f 158^v

⁴² Perhaps by Augustine ⁴³ MS *ggnicione*

⁴⁴ Commonly *de ecclesiasticis officiis*

⁴⁵ Peter of Cluny Ely had the epistle on the Mohammedans, MS Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 335, Henton an unnamed treatise by Peter of Cluny, and Meaux an epistle to G a monk

- de utilitate tribulacionis ⁴⁵ Augustinus de fide rerum inuisibilium
Defensorium dotacionis
- 45 ecclesie in vno quaterno —
Omnigedrium Epistola Jeronimi ad iusticum in libro j ligato
Duo quateini parui in quibus sunt Kalendaria
Vnus quateinus paruus de fabulis quondam W Barlby ⁴⁶
Jsidorus de summo bono Jsidorus de creaturarum Quidam tracta-
tus de baptismo Jn-
- 50 troitus super cantica canticorum ⁴⁷ in vno volumine ligato —
Quidam paruus liber quondam fratris carmelite ⁴⁸ de medicinis et alijs
pluribus [in manu ferma]]
Jtinerarium mentis in deum ⁴⁹ Tractatus super cantica Alloquia
spiritus sancti ⁵⁰ Tres quaterni de
bonis notabilibus Augustinus de cura agenda pro mortuis Augustinus
contra mendacium partim
Quidam tractatus de compoto in j quaterno
- 55 Hulcote super sapienciam fere in vno quaterno
Omelie gregori in vno quaterno aliquid ligato
Lina super psalterium in vno [] ⁵¹ quaterno viridi
Petrus alfonsus de fabulis De dispensacione prelatorum in iure ⁵²
Statuta otho- ⁵³
nis legati Alfabetum herbarum in vno [] ⁵⁴ quaterno
- 60 Ties quateini de diuersis versibus De penis purgatori] patricij
Quedam notabilia
Augustinus de ciuitate dei Jtem allocucio de obediencia inter ipsum
et disciplinum Jtem de vita
ade et Eue in vno quaterno —
Jtem j magnus libri in quateinis papiri scilicet xij quaternis
[Joh W]
Jtem gregorius super ezechielem et plura alia in vno volumine
ligato — —
- 65 Jtem quidam quateinus de cura equorum ⁵⁵ in quaterno —
Jtem Bartholomeus de casibus in vno volumine ligato

⁴⁵ Perhaps Peter of Blois' *De duodecim utilibus tribulationis*

⁴⁶ MS *quod*, with a line from the l in *fabul* over *qu*. For other names of owners see lines 51, 63, 67, 68 9, 70, 71, 73, 74 Barlby may be Barlby by Selby in Yorkshire

⁴⁷ MS *cantic' cantic'*

⁴⁸ Also in l 70

⁴⁹ MS *dm*

⁵⁰ Perhaps by Augustine

⁵¹ Two letters are marked out, possibly *vn*, repeating *vno* by error

⁵² A work of similar title is ascribed to Henry Bowhit in the Syon catalogue, N35

⁵³ Cf note 2

⁵⁴ MS *volumine*, crossed out

⁵⁵ By Palladius

- Jtem quaternus ex dono Willelmi Rypp' ⁵⁶ in quaterno papiri
 Jtem iij quaterni astronomie ligati aliquid aliter cum 4 alijs quaternis
 North' ⁵⁷
 Jtem vnus liber rubius ligatus de astronomia scilicet sancti iacobi
 iuxta North' ⁵⁸
- 70 Jtem liber de sortibus et alkymia fratris carmelite ⁵⁹
 Jtem liber de astronomia et de greco quondam Johannis Lord ⁶⁰
 Jtem passio Nichodemus Blesensis super Job Imago mundi Jtem visio
 turchildi in vno paruo quaterno quondam Willelmi Eylond' ⁶¹
 Jtem vetus quaternus quondam domini thome Ham'lden ⁶² cum alijs —
- 75 Jtem 31 quaterni de phisica Jtem viij quaterni excepcionum [] ⁶³
 sermonum sancti Augustini
 Jtem j quaternus papiri de dictis Walteri Hilton' et aliorum Jtem
 ij quaterni de transitu
 ad ierusalem ⁶⁴ cum alijs iij quaternis de sermonibus et sanctorum
 dictis simul ligatis —
 Jtem liber nemroth' ⁶⁵ in vj quaternis Jtem ij quaterni de aspectibus
 planetarum et alijs Jtem vetus
 quaternus papiri de medicinis Jtem j quaternus Willelmi de montibus
 Jtem vj quaterni ⁶⁶ al-
- 80 berti de animalibus Jtem quaterni de questionibus elemosinarum
 ecclesie Jtem v quaterni pergameni
 de sermonibus Jtem propheta metodij Jtem j quaternus vetus de
 medicinis et alijs Jtem iij
 quaterni de fabulis papiri Statuta benedicti ⁶⁷ Matutine de nomine
 ihesu ⁶⁸ Quaternus

⁵⁶ The p's are crossed below the line

⁵⁷ Northampton, explained in the next line

⁵⁸ The Augustinian abbey of St James, Northampton, added by the scribe

⁵⁹ Also in line 51

⁶⁰ A John Lord, priest, was the incumbent of Stotesbury, of which the patron was St Andrew's, Northampton, in 1410, and of Irlingborough, of which the patron was Peterborough, in 1417, George Baker, *The history and antiquities of the county of Northampton* (London, 1822-41), I, 202, 691

⁶¹ Yealand, co Lancaster, is also Eylond

⁶² The m is not certain here, there is a mark like a modern apostrophe after the first of the three parts of the m, and there is a line above *mlden*. Perhaps this is Hauerilden

⁶³ MS *sr Aug*, crossed out.

⁶⁴ Perhaps Mandeville's *Travels*, which is in two books

⁶⁵ Perhaps the book begins with "Nemroth"

⁶⁶ The *Animalia* is in six books

⁶⁷ The Constitutions or Statutes of Pope Benedict XII for the monastic orders

⁶⁸ Perhaps the text entitled "Matutine in veneratione nominis Jhesu

in gallico dictus la Femme ⁶⁹ Jtem Bernardus de dignitate sacerdotum
Quedam

RAMONA BRESSIE

Chicago

NUMERICAL SYMBOLISM IN DANTE AND THE PEARL

Dante's use of numerical symbolism in the *Divine Comedy* is well known, but apparently less familiar is the *Pearl*-poet's similar use of it. As the *Divine Comedy* is built upon the numbers 3, 9, and 10, so the *Pearl* is built upon 3, 4, and 12. As the numerical symbolism of Dante has its roots in the Bible, so that of the *Pearl* has its roots in the Bible, and in particular in the Book of Revelation, chapter 21. From this chapter, it will be recalled, the author of *Pearl* borrowed his description of the New Jerusalem with its twelve foundations (*Pe.* 993-1022), its four walls each twelve furlongs in length (*Pe.* 1030), and its twelve gates set three in each wall (*Pe.* 1034-35)

Penne helde uch sware of þis manayre,
Twelve forlonge space er ever hit fon,
Of heȝt, of brede, of lenȝe, to cayre,
For meten hit syȝ þe apostel John

As John hym wrytez ȝet more I syȝe
Uch pane of þat place had þre ȝateȝ,
So twelve in poursent I con asspye,
Þe portales pyked of ryȝh plates (1029-36)

In these lines of *Pearl* is found sufficient explanation of the poet's choice of twelve and its factors, since the description of the City is built upon 12, 4, and 3, and since the vision of the New Jerusalem is the climax of the poem toward which the action may be said to rise. Had the author made only conventional use of his numbers there would be nothing remarkable in his employment of them. But the three numbers borrowed from Revelation are woven into the very fabric of the poem, determining its metrical and structural pattern, as well as much of its ornament.

edite a beato Ricardo de Hampole" in MS Kk VI 20 in the University Library, Cambridge

⁶⁹There is a copy of this French-English school text in MS All Souls College, Oxford, 182

The stanzas and lines are governed by 12, 4, and 3, each stanza containing twelve lines and three rimes, each line containing four stresses, and many lines alliterating on three words or four

Perle plesaunte to Pynces paye,
To clanky clos in golde so clere' (1/2)

The number of stanzas being 101, there are 1212 lines in all

Of the 101 stanzas, the first 99 are divided like the *Divine Comedy* into three groups of approximately equal length, and to these are added two stanzas that form an epilogue. In the *Divine Comedy* there are 99 cantos preceded by an introductory canto. Between the groups, transitions occur in stanzas 33 and 65, in each of which the dreamer asks the *Pearl*-maiden questions regarding the life she leads. Especially to be noted in these transitional stanzas are the balanced queries in lines 389-92 and 771-74, and the verbal echoes between lines 392 and 774. In the first part there are 33 stanzas, in the second part 32, and in the fourth 34, making a total of 99 stanzas, plus 2, or 101 in all. Similarly in Dante the *Inferno* has 34 cantos, the *Purgatorio* and the *Paradiso* 33 each. It has been suggested that stanza 72, in the third part of *Pearl* is supernumerary,¹ but the division of the poem here suggested makes such a view unnecessary, indeed, demands the presence of stanza 72 to bring the number of stanzas in the three parts to 99, a multiple of three.

The reality of this tripartite division of the poem can readily be proved by an examination of the mood and subject of each of the main divisions. At the beginning of the poem the dreamer, cast down by grief, enters the garden where his *Pearl* has slipped away. There, in a vision, he sees a fair country, and beyond a stream the maiden he has lost. The sight fills him with joy, but grief quickly returns when he finds he cannot join her. Then under the influence of the maiden's firm but gentle persuasion, his grief gives way and in stanza 33 he humbly questions her regarding the life she leads.

Bot now I am here in your presente,
I wolde bysech wythouten debate
3e wolde me say in sobre asente
What lyf 3e lede erly & late (389-92)

¹ Ten Brink, *Hist.*, I, 349, note 2, Osgood, *Pearl*, Boston, 1906, XLVI, note 1, Gollancz, *Pearl*, London, 1921, 157

In the second part, the maiden, answering his question, explains that she who died at two years of age is now through the grace of God a bride of Christ, and that he who grieves over the loss of an earthly pearl, may by a return to innocence purchase the heavenly pearl which is everlasting life. Then in stanza 65, assured that his Pearl is safe and that a means of salvation is open to him, the dreamer asks two more questions regarding the nature of Him who has chosen the maiden for His bride.

Quat kyn þyng may be þat Lambe
 þat þe wolde wedde unto hys wyf?
 Over alle oþer so hyz þou clambe
 To lede wyth hym so ladyly lyf? (771-74)

These questions mark the second great turning point in the poem, thereafter the dreamer is carried up from a discussion of salvation to the vision of the New Jerusalem and of Christ with his company of 144,000 virgins. Among these appears his Pearl, of whose salvation he is now assured. In an ecstasy of joy he attempts to cross the stream that intervenes between them. But the effort is too great, he awakens in the garden where he had fallen asleep, and the vision melts away (stanzas 98 and 99). In the remaining two stanzas that form the epilogue the dreamer moralizes upon the mercy of God and submission to His will.

The division of the *Pearl* into three parts is the most impressive instance of the poet's use of numerical symbolism, but not content with casting line, stanza, and poem in a pattern of 3, 4, and 12, the author carries the numbers 3 and 4 into the smallest details of his work.

As Dante meets three beasts (*Inf* I, 30-51), has three guides (Virgil, Beatrice, and St. Bernard), mounts three steps to the gate of Purgatory (*Purg* ix, 94-102), and sees the three theological virtues on the right side of the car (*Purg* xxix, 121) and the four moral virtues on the left (*Ibid*, 130), so our poet is guilty of three errors (*Pe*. 290-300), asks four questions (*Pe* 560-65), addresses four terms of adoration to the Virgin (*Pe* 433-36), and likens Christ three times to a Lamb (*Pe*. 853-54). The fair country where he falls asleep has flowers of three colors yellow, blue, and red (*Pe* 27), and on the hill where his Pearl slipped away grow four flowers gillyflower, ginger, gromwell, and peony (*Pe*. 43-44). In lines 441-42 the Virgin Mary is said

to be empress in three realms heaven, earth, and hell, and in lines 458-59 we are said to be members of Jesus Christ "as head, and arm, and leg, and nail"

While the number of passages might be augmented in which 12, 4, and 3 play a part,² enough have been cited to show that the use of these numbers cannot be accidental. That their use in *Pearl* was suggested by a similar employment of 3, 9, and 10 in the *Divine Comedy* is highly probable. Evidence that the English poet was familiar with the work of Dante grows increasingly strong, as the list of parallels noted by Osgood,³ and the still more impressive list collected by Olivero prove.⁴ Alike in their intense Christian faith and in their dependence upon the Bible, Dante and the author of the *Pearl* were alike in their employment of three numbers significant in Christian symbolism. This striking similarity in workmanship, taken in conjunction with the parallels in mood, diction, and descriptive detail noted by Osgood and others, seems to me convincing evidence of the English poet's familiarity with the *Divine Comedy*.

COOLIDGE OTIS CHAPMAN

College of Puget Sound

EXETER BOOK RIDDLE 41 AS A CONTINUATION OF RIDDLE 40¹

Riddles 40 and 41 of the Exeter Book have presented a number of difficulties for the scholar. Riddle 40 ends with the introductory words of a subordinate clause, lacks a formal ending and a concluding sign. 41 is likewise fragmentary, beginning with a participle, possessing no initial capital, and almost defying solution. Various answers have been proposed. Dietrich solved it as "Earth,"²

² See lines 118, 227, 246, 383, 786, 869-70, 886, 1078-79, 1203

³ *Op cit*, xxvi-xxviii

⁴ *La Perla*, Torino, 1926, notes, *passim*

¹ The numbering and text of the Exeter Book Riddles are of F. Tupper, *The Riddles of the Exeter Book*, Boston, 1910

² F. Dietrich, "Die Ratsel des Exeterbuches, Würdigung, Lösung und Herstellung," *Haupts Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, xi (1859), p. 473

Trautman as "Fire,"³ Tupper first as "Wisdom,"⁴ giving an esoteric meaning to *sweartestan*, and later as "Water."⁵ To meet some of the difficulties, it has been suggested that a folio sheet is missing, containing the end of Riddle 40 and the beginning of 41. This opinion is endorsed by Thorpe,⁶ Tupper,⁷ Krapp and Dobbie,⁸ and Forster.⁹ Forster bases his belief, however, not on the condition of the manuscript, which he examined carefully, but only on inconclusive textual evidence. On the other hand, Schipper¹⁰ believes the only folio missing in the manuscript is that after 37, Wulker¹¹ says with reference to a folio between 111 and 112, "In der Hs ist keine lücke wahrnehmbar," and Mackie¹² finds no MS evidence of a missing folio. In the absence of more conclusive evidence, we must seek another explanation for the seeming incompleteness of the two riddles in question.

It has long been recognized that Riddle 40 is a translation of Aldhelm's hundredth riddle, the "De Creatura."¹³ The method of the translator varies. His rendering is at first rather strict, with certain minor changes¹⁴ warranted by the differing conventions of the two languages. It shortly becomes much more free, however, and not only does the Old English poet expand what he translates, but he omits and transposes, translating lines 65-67 of Aldhelm before line 44 (as lines 92-97 before l 98).

³ M Trautman, "Die Auflösungen der altenglischen Ratsel," *Anglia Beiblatt*, v (1894), p 49

⁴ F Tupper, "Originals and Analogues of the Exeter Book Riddles," *Modern Language Notes*, xviii (1903), p 104

⁵ F Tupper, *The Riddles of the Exeter Book*, Boston, 1910, pp 171-172

⁶ B Thorpe, *Codex Exoniensis*, London, 1842

⁷ F Tupper, *The Riddles of the Exeter Book*, Boston, 1910, n 34

⁸ G P Krapp and E Dobbie, *The Exeter Book*, New York, 1936

⁹ M Forster, "General Description of the Manuscript," *The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry*, London, 1933

¹⁰ J Schipper, "Zum Codex Exoniensis," *Germania*, xix (1874), p 327 ff

¹¹ R P Wulker, ed by G W M Grein, *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie*, Leipzig, 1898, iii, p 211

¹² W S Mackie, *The Exeter Book*, Part II, London, 1934

¹³ The numbering and text of Aldhelm's Riddle C are those of J H Pitman, "The Riddles of Aldhelm," *Yale Studies in English*, lxvii, New Haven, 1925, p 1 ff

¹⁴ See F Tupper, *The Riddles of the Exeter Book*, Boston, 1910, pp 161-164, and G A Wood, "Anglo Saxon Riddles," *Aberystwyth Studies*, University College of Wales, II (1914), pp 1-41

In what is now termed Riddle 41, obvious references are made to what has gone before, in 40 *monigra cynna* of l 2 refers to the many creatures mentioned of which Nature is the mother, *swear-testan* of l 3 to the black whale of ll 92-97, paralleling Aldhelm's 65-67, and possibly also ll 55-56 of Aldhelm, untranslated by the Old English poet, *selestan* of l 3 and *deorestan* of l 4 seem to refer not only to what has gone before in the Old English version but also to the precious articles mentioned in ll 57-61 of Aldhelm and omitted in what we have of the Old English. Lines 1-4, of Riddle "41," may therefore be construed as a summary of Riddle 40 and as partaking in the progressively greater freedom of the translator's method. In lines 6-10 the translator again reverts to a stricter method, paralleling the two concluding lines of Aldhelm's Riddle (ll 82-83).

Et tamen infitians non retur frivola lector'
Sciscitor inflatos, fungai quo nomine, sofos,

by four (Riddle "41," ll. 6-9)

Ne magon we her in eorþan owiht lifgan,
nymðe we brucen þæs þe bearn doð
þæt is to geþencanne þeoda gehwylcum,
wisfæstum weum, hwæt seo wiht sy

This conclusion is of a relatively unusual type, paralleled with any closeness in only two other Exeter Book riddles: by 28, which ends (ll 12-13).

micel is to hycganne
wisfæstum menn hwæt seo wiht sy. 7

and by 31, which ends (ll 23-24).

micel is to hycgenne
wisum woð boran hwæt (sio) wiht sie7

In both these cases, the parallel to Aldhelm's conclusion is not nearly so close as that of Riddle "41."

A portion of Aldhelm, ll. 51-64 and 68-91, remains still unrepresented in the Old English translation. Most of this was probably omitted by the translator who, as Herzfeld¹⁵ and Prehn¹⁶ among

¹⁵ G. Herzfeld, "Die Ratsel des Exeterbuches und ihr Verfasser," *Acta Germanica*, Berlin, 1890, Bd II, Heft I, p. 27

¹⁶ A. Prehn, "Komposition und Quellen der Ratsel des Exeterbuches," *Neuphilologische Studien*, Paderborn, 1883, Heft III, p. 213

others have pointed out, consistently attempts to Anglicize and Christianize Aldhelm's matter. This omission is made the more probable by the Old English poet's having translated lines 65-67, out of the midst of this section dealing with material he would not normally use, and placed them, as lines 92-97, before lines 98-107 which they would normally follow. The manuscript of 40 breaks off only a few lines before the portion we should not expect him to translate.

Only a small portion of Aldhelm's text remains which would, in all likelihood, be translated, and this may be represented in a brief lacuna occurring at the bottom of folio 111v or at the top of folio 112r, especially since 112 is the first folio of a new gathering. The half-obliterated words at the base of folio 111v, first noticed by Wulker¹⁷ who was able to make out *hæt is* and found the remaining twelve letters or so undecipherable, subsequently made out by Tupper,¹⁸ to be *sio creatura pr*, may constitute an attempt to fill this gap, but examination of the facsimile reproduction reveals to me only a few illegible letters. Förster¹⁹ makes no mention of these. It is easy, however, to supply the sense of such a lacuna which might, at its briefest, run *þæt he* (becomes fat and rejoices the heart of the swineherd. I am that which is eternally) *ednwu, þæt is moddor monigra cynna*, etc.

Therefore, since "Riddle 41" provides us with a summary of its "predecessor" and exhibits definite parallels to its original in Aldhelm, we have the possibility of considering these two fragments a relatively complete riddle, with a regular beginning and a formal conclusion—a conclusion which clearly translates the conclusion of their common source.

MARCUS KONICK

University of Pennsylvania

NOTES SUR JEAN RENART

I. La date de *L'Escoufle*.

Depuis la fin du siècle dernier, les œuvres de Jean Renart suscitent un intérêt des plus vifs et font l'objet de nombreuses études.

¹⁷ R. P. Wulker, *op cit*, p. 211

¹⁸ F. Tupper, *The Riddles of the Exeter Book*, Boston, 1910

¹⁹ M. Förster, *op cit*.

L'auteur du *Lai de l'ombre* a lentement pris corps avec les années. Son œuvre s'est élargie, son style et sa pensée se sont précisés. Il commence à prendre, dans la littérature du moyen âge, une place considérable. Cependant un problème capital reste à résoudre : l'époque précise à laquelle il a vécu.

Dans le cours de ces dernières années, je me suis efforcé de démontrer que la période généralement assignée à la composition de ses trois principaux ouvrages (1200-1220) devrait être reculée d'environ un quart de siècle (1220-1245). Je crois avoir démontré que le *Lai de l'ombre* ne saurait être antérieur à la capture de Miles de Nanteuil par les Sarrasins en 1219,¹ que *Guillaume de Dole* a été composé après le voyage de Miles en "Avalterre" (mars-avril 1227).² Reste *L'Escoufle*. La date que j'avais proposée pour la rédaction de ce roman³ (vers 1244) a été rejetée par V. F. Koenig⁴ et par Mme Lejeune-Dehousse.⁵ Je reconnais aujourd'hui que les arguments présentés par moi (comparaison entre l'empereur du roman et Frédéric II Hohenstaufen, entre la croisade de Richard de Montivilliers et celle de Richard d'Angleterre) constituent plutôt des présomptions que des preuves. Mais ce qu'on m'a le plus reproché, c'est d'avoir placé la composition de *L'Escoufle* après celle du *Lai de l'ombre* et de *Guillaume de Dole*. On m'a accusé d'avoir négligé un passage du *Lai de l'ombre* où l'on veut voir une allusion à *L'Escoufle*. En voici le texte

Par Guillaume qui depieca
L'escoufle et art un a un membre
Si com li contes nous remembre

"Sûrement cette citation de *L'Escoufle* a été amenée de loin. On serait presque tenté de croire que Jean Renart s'est cité lui-même."⁷ "Comment la mention indiscutable de *L'Escoufle* dans le *Lai* s'expliquerait-elle si *L'Escoufle* était postérieur de plus

¹ *Modern Philology*, xxx (1933), 351-359

² *Romanic Review* xxviii (1937), 109-121

³ *Modern Philology*, xxx (1933), 241-256

⁴ *Modern Philology*, xxxii (1935), 343-352

⁵ *L'œuvre de Jean Renart* (Liège-Paris 1935), 213-218

⁶ *Le Lai de l'ombre*, ed. Joseph Bédier, "Société des anciens textes français" (Paris, 1913), vss 22-24

⁷ *L'Escoufle*, ed. Paul Meyer, "Société des anciens textes français" (Paris, 1894), introd. pp. xl-xli

de vingt ans à ce *Lar*?⁸ Mais cette mention est-elle bien indiscutable?

La légende du rapt d'un bijou par un oiseau de proie, qui forme le thème principal de *L'Escoufle*, n'était certes point nouvelle au commencement du *XIII^e siècle*. Elle était probablement d'origine orientale, car on en trouve une adaptation dans les *Mille et une nuits* (Bouldour et Kamaralzaman). En Occident, elle paraît pour la première fois dans *Guillaume d'Angleterre*,⁹ elle constitue le fond d'un poème allemand, *Der Busant*,¹⁰ qui semble contemporain de *L'Escoufle*. Jean Renart ne prétendait nullement l'avoir inventée. Il affirme au contraire l'avoir trouvée dans un *conte* où il a puisé abondamment, dont il a emprunté jusqu'au titre

9073 Mais c'est drois que li romans ait
Autietel non comme li contes

Or, n'est-ce pas à ce *conte* qu'il est fait allusion dans le *Lar de l'ombre*? L'auteur écrit en effet

Si com li contes nous remembie

Pourquoi n'a-t-il pas employé le mot *roman* au lieu de *conte*, s'il a voulu se citer lui-même? Le vers n'en eût point souffert. C'est qu'il n'avait pas encore composé son roman. Peut-être songeait-il déjà à le faire, mais il n'est point vrai qu'il se soit cité dans le *Lar*.

Ce qui est en tout cas certain, c'est que *L'Escoufle* est la dernière en date des trois grandes œuvres de Jean Renart, car si l'entrain, la gaieté, la spontanéité et l'ironie sans amertume, qui se dégagent du *Lar* et de *Guillaume de Dole*, y révèlent un talent jeune et vif, mais déjà sûr de lui, *L'Escoufle* nous apparaît au contraire comme l'œuvre d'un auteur mûri par les années. Il montre moins de fougue et plus de réflexion, ses lectures se sont élargies, il a perdu une grande partie de son originalité. La fine analyse des sentiments, le réalisme vif et puissant, qui caractérisent les deux premiers poèmes, comme Mme Lejeune-Dehousse l'a si bien remarqué, font place en bien des endroits dans *L'Escoufle* à la pesante rhétorique

⁸ Rita Lejeune Dehousse, *op cit*, 215

⁹ Ed Wilmotte, "Classiques français du moyen âge" (Paris, 1927), v. 877-884

¹⁰ Le texte en a été publié par Von der Hagen, dans *Gesamtabenteuer* (Stuttgart, 1850), vol. I. Voir aussi Koehler, *Germania*, xvii (1872), pp 62-64, Paul Meyer, *L'Escoufle*, introd., pp xxviii-xxx

amoureuse inspirée des romans de Chrétien de Troyes, à des descriptions banales qui sentent l'exercice académique, où l'on ne trouve aucun détail personnel, aucun trait qui ariête l'imagination ou la pensée. Pour s'en rendre compte, il suffit de comparer la conversation du chevalier et de la dame, dans le *Lai de l'ombre*, aux amours de Guillaume et d'Aélis, et le couronnement de Liénor dans *Guillaume de Dole*, à celui de Guillaume et d'Aélis. A l'époque où il écrit *L'Escoufle*, Jean Renart commence à décliner. Il a perdu l'ardeur de ses jeunes années, il est plus calme, plus assagi, plus influencé par ses lectures, son inspiration a parfois le souffle court. La mort l'a privé de son protecteur, l'aristocratique et brillant évêque de Beauvais, à la cour duquel il vivait, il dédicace son roman à un comte de Hainaut qu'il ne connaît pas, sa situation matérielle est sans doute moins prospère, peut-être même difficile. Certes, il est loin encore de la décrépitude physique et morale dont il sera plus tard accablé, à l'époque du *Plant* et de *Renart et Pseudoué*. *L'Escoufle* est une œuvre fort respectable, mais on y trouve bien diminuées les qualités qui font du *Lai de l'ombre* et de *Guillaume de Dole* deux des joyaux les plus précieux de la littérature française au XIII^e siècle.

Je répète donc ce que j'ai déjà affirmé : *L'Escoufle* est postérieur aux deux autres grandes œuvres de Jean Renart, et à la mort de Miles de Nanteuil (1234). Par conséquent, le comte de Hainaut à qui le roman est dédié doit être Thomas de Savoie (1237-1244) ou Jean I^{er} d'Avesnes (1244-1256).

2. La date de *Renart et Pseudoué*

Dans l'étude que j'avais consacrée, en 1933, au roman de *L'Escoufle*, je m'étais aussi occupé des deux tençons *Renart et Pseudoué* et *Du Plant Renart de Dammartin contre Varon son roncin*,¹¹ et j'avais fixé la composition de ces deux pièces aux environs de 1260.¹² Mme Lejeune-Dehousse a rejeté mes conclusions. Elle affirme qu'au moment de la rédaction de *Renart et Pseudoué*, le second des interlocuteurs, Girard Pseudoué, n'était pas encore prêtre.¹³ Or, un des textes sur lesquels elle s'appuie.

XXXVII 1 Ah! Clers! plus ne frougeras
 N'a clergie plus n'entendras

¹¹ Mme Lejeune-Dehousse a donné une édition critique de ces deux pièces dans *L'œuvre de Jean Renart*, 407-423.

¹² *Modern Philology*, xxx (1933), 257-260.

¹³ *L'œuvre de Jean Renart*, 390-391.

semble prouver, non point que Piaudoue n'était pas encore prêtre, mais au contraire qu'il ne l'était plus, ou tout au moins qu'il n'exerçait plus ses fonctions ecclésiastiques. Nous savons qu'il les exerçait encore en 1248, puisque c'est sous l'archiépiscopat d'Eudes Rigaud (1248-1275) qu'il fut investi de la cure de Saint-Nicolas de Vernonnet, près de Vernon.¹⁴ Nous savons également qu'il les exerçait encore en 1256, car il figure à cette époque dans les comptes de Jean Sarrasin, pour la somme de cent sols, *pro decima*.¹⁵ Nous croyons qu'il est même possible de reculer davantage la date de *Renart et Piaudoue*. Nous trouvons en effet, dans le journal des visites pastorales d'Eudes Rigaud, à la date du 24 décembre 1267, la mention suivante

Ipsa die, resignavit in manu nostra ecclesiam de Vernonnet Guinardus, rector eiusdem.¹⁶

Ce Girard, curé de Vernonnet en 1267, semble bien être le même que le Girard Piaudoue, qui figure comme curé de Vernonnet dans le *Polypticum*.¹⁷ Pourquoi se démit-il de sa charge? Sans doute parce qu'il y fut forcé, car nous savons que c'était la punition habituellement infligée par Eudes Rigaud aux prêtres coupables d'incontinence ou d'ivrognerie. Au nombre de ces derniers, se trouvait un prédécesseur de Piaudoue, peut-être son prédécesseur immédiat, un nommé Pierre, qui ayant été reconnu coupable d'inconduite en 1261, dut alors signer une promesse de résigner sa charge s'il récidivait.¹⁸ Or, si nous en croyons certaines accusations que Renart porte contre lui dans la tenson, Piaudoue n'était point un modèle de vertu, bien au contraire. Il est donc fort probable qu'il a été forcé de donner sa démission. Mais comme il a rempli les devoirs de sa charge jusqu'au 24 décembre 1267, la tenson *Renart et Piaudoue* doit être postérieure à cette date.

The University of Maine

L.-A. VIGNERAS

¹⁴ *Polypticum Rotomagensis Dioecesis*, "Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France," XXIII, 305-306

¹⁵ *Tabulae Ceratae Johannis Sarraceni*, *ibid*, XXI, 348. Voir aussi *Modern Philology*, XXX (1933), 258

¹⁶ *Journal des visites pastorales d'Eudes Rigaud*, ed Th. Bonnin (Rouen, 1852), 591

¹⁷ Voir note 14. Voir aussi *Modern Philology*, XXX (1933), 259

XXVII 1

¹⁸ *Journal des visites*, p. 665. Voir aussi p. 444

DER ZERBROCHENE KRUG UND KONIG OIDIPUS

Der Vergleich zwischen Kleists Drama *Der Zerbrochene Krug* und dem *König Oidipus* des Sophokles, der heute gang und gebe geworden ist, ist von dem Dichter geradezu herausgefordert worden, indem er in der ursprünglichen, später jedoch weggelassenen Vorrede zu seinem Lustspiel auf das griechische Drama hinweist. „. der Gerichtsschreiber sah (er hatte vielleicht kurz vorher das Mädchen angesehen) jetzt den Richter misstrauisch zur Seite an, wie Kreon, bei einer ähnlichen Gelegenheit den Oedip,“ und über der Zeile befindet sich ein Zusatz „als die Frage war, wer den Laïos erschlagen?“¹ Wenn sich diese Bemerkung auch nur auf eine Nebenperson bezieht, den Schreiber Licht, so ist man doch nicht berechtigt, ein solches Zeugnis aus dem Munde des Dichters zu übergehen, denn es zeigt unter allen Umständen, dass ihm eine gewisse Parallelität zwischen seinem Drama und der griechischen Tragödie vorschwebte. Bis zu welchem Grade besteht diese Parallelität wirklich?

Wenn man Kleists Hinweis auf den *König Oidipus* einer genauen Prüfung unterzieht, so muss einem zunächst die sonderbare Tatsache auffallen, dass eine Stelle wie die, auf die er Bezug nimmt, in der klassischen Tragödie nicht existiert. Vor der Enthüllung der Schuld des Titelhelden tritt Kreon zweimal auf, doch scheint sich eine Situation wie die von Kleist gekennzeichnete nicht zu ergeben. Im Anfang des Dramas kommt er mit dem Orakelspruch aus Delphi, ohne dass er bisher auch nur eine Ahnung haben kann, dass Oidipus der Schuldige ist, der der Rache des Gottes preisgegeben werden soll. In der folgenden Szene, die die Unterredung zwischen Oidipus und dem Seher Teiresias enthält, ist Kreon nicht anwesend und kommt erst nach ihrem Abschluss wieder auf die Bühne, um sich vor dem Volke von den Vorwürfen, die Oidipus gegen ihn erhoben hat, zu reinigen. In diesem Stadium der Handlung ist die Beschuldigung des Oidipus schon offen ausgesprochen, ohne dass sich während Kreons Anwesenheit auf der Bühne irgendein Moment ergibt, dass die Angaben des Sehers zu bekräftigen oder zu widerlegen geeignet wäre. Ob Kreon den Angaben des Sehers Glauben geschenkt hat oder nicht, ist eine Frage, die im Drama nicht

¹ H v Kleists Werke, herausgegeben von Erich Schmidt, IV, 318

berührt wird. Möglich wäre es an sich, doch ist es ausserordentlich unwahrscheinlich, denn die äusseren Umstände scheinen zur Zeit noch so stark gegen die Annahme einer Täterschaft des Oidipus zu sprechen, dass der Chor auf die Anschuldigungen des Sehers überhaupt nicht eingeht. Wie dem aber auch sei, eine Gelegenheit für misstrauische Seitenblicke Kreons besteht unter keinen Umständen, denn man wüßte solche Blicke nicht auf eine Person, auf die man einen bestimmten vorher gefassten Argwohn hat. Gerechtfertigt wäre ein solches Verhalten des Kreon nur, wenn ihm während seiner Anwesenheit auf der Bühne langsam ein Verdacht gegen Oidipus aufzudämmern anfinge, aber das ist, wie gesagt, nicht der Fall. Dass Kreon, der Oidipus gegenübersteht und sein Leben und seine Ehre gegen dessen Anklagen zu verteidigen hat, seine Lage durch misstrauische Seitenblicke verschlechtern sollte, ist geradezu undenkbar. Kleists Erinnerung an die griechische Tragödie ist offensichtlich durch sein eigenes Lustspiel getrübt, sodass er das Verhalten Lichts auf Kreon überträgt, ohne sich darüber klar zu sein, dass trotz der Ähnlichkeit ihrer Stellung die von ihm zum Vergleich herangezogene Situation im *König Oidipus* tatsächlich nicht existiert.

Wenn man sich diesen Umstand vor Augen hält, so zeigt sich deutlich, dass der Dichter bei der Niederschrift der *Vorrede* nur sehr unklare Vorstellungen der ihm ehemals wohl bekannten Tragödie hatte, sodass der Hinweis auf den *König Oidipus* erheblich an Bedeutung verliert, und darüber hinaus darf man wohl annehmen, dass er bei der Anfertigung seines Lustspiels nur wenig an die alte Tragödie gedacht hat und sie unter keinen Umständen als Vorbild benutzt hat, denn sonst wäre ihm ein solcher Fehler auch im Falle einer nachträglichen Abfassung der *Vorrede* nicht unterlaufen. Das bedeutet, dass man sich sehr davor hüten muss, die beiden Dramen zu eng aneinander zu rücken, und vor allen Dingen wird dadurch die Möglichkeit ausgeschlossen, dass Kleist eine bewusste Nachahmung des *König Oidipus* auf dem Gebiete des Komischen vorzunehmen beabsichtigte. Tatsächlich sind die beiden Dramen ganz verschiedener Natur, wie schon verschiedentlich bemerkt, aber noch nicht mit der notwendigen Deutlichkeit ausgesprochen worden ist. Der wichtigste Unterschied zwischen ihnen liegt in der Stellung des Haupthelden. Adam weiss von vornherein, dass er schuldig ist, während Oidipus sich im guten Glauben an seine Unschuld befindet; dagegen ist beiden Werken die Tatsache gemein-

sam, dass der Richter selbst die schuldige Person ist und dass seine Schuld im Laufe der Dichtung offenbar wird. Wie wirken sich diese Umstände auf den Charakter der beiden Dichtungen aus?

Der *König Oidipus* ist die Tragödie des Menschen, den die Gotter haben schuldig werden lassen und nunmehr seiner Pein überlassen, ohne dass der Betroffene auch nur ahnt, dass er sich in Schuld verstrickt hat, denn der ganze naheie Sachverhalt war ihm unbekannt und offenbart sich ihm erst während der Handlung. Einen menschlichen oder nur irdischen Konflikt gibt es nicht, sondern es wird allein die Grosse und Erhabenheit der Gotter gefeiert, und ihre Unerbittlichkeit gegenüber dem irrenden Menschen dargestellt. Der Antrieb der Handlung liegt stets bei den Gottern, bzw. bei dem Schicksal. Durch Orakelsprüche oder Seher wird der Wille dieser transzendenten Mächte deutlich, und zur rechten Zeit stellt sich die einzige Person ein, die Aufklärung geben kann und auch bereit ist, sie zu geben, nämlich der Bote aus Korinth, der den jungen Oidipus vor vielen Jahren nach dieser Stadt gebracht hat. Dieses unerwartete Auftreten eines der wenigen Zeugen langst vergangener Ereignisse erscheint vom ästhetischen Standpunkt als ein blosser Zufall und ist nur vom religiösen Standpunkt aus durch den Glauben an die Allmacht der Gotter motiviert. Zwar ist die Aufhellung der Vergangenheit das Ziel aller Figuren, die im Stücke auftreten, aber ob diese Aufklärung zustande kommt oder nicht, hängt nicht von ihnen, sondern ausschliesslich von den Gottern ab, wie auch der Anstoss zu den neuen Nachforschungen nach dem Morder des Lajus unmittelbar durch das göttliche Orakel veranlasst ist. Die Rolle des Oidipus ist rein passiv, er kämpft nicht, da er nichts hat, wofür oder wogegen er kämpfen kann, unerbittlich bricht das Unglück über ihn herein und er muss verzweifeln. Die Vergangenheit lässt sich nicht auslöschen und die Gegenwart ist auf Grund eines unerforschlichen Ratschlusses der Gotter durch sie bestimmt, gleichgültig, was der Mensch tut. Die Unsterblichen verlangen ein Opfer, willenlos müssen die Sterblichen sich ihnen fügen.

Von einem solchen Fatalismus ist im *Zerbrochenen Krug* keine Rede, dem Lustspiel steht der Schicksalsgedanke denkbar fern. Adam ist sich seiner Schuld bewusst, aber er denkt nicht daran, zu resignieren oder zu verzweifeln, sondern versucht, sie zu verheimlichen und auf diese Weise um die verdiente Strafe herumzukommen. An die Stelle eines blossen passiven Über-sich-ergehen-

lassens tritt Kampf bis zum letzten. Dieser Kampf ist keinesfalls ein bloss ausseres Geschehen, wie Gundolf unter volliger Verken-
nung des Lustspiels behauptet,² sondern beruht auf einem ernsten
dramatischen Konflikt. Auf der einen Seite steht das Gesetz,
vertreten durch den Gerichtsrat Walter, auf der anderen Seite
Adam. Adam hat das Gesetz verletzt und das Drama zeigt in einer
geistreich-witzigen Szenenfolge seine Bemuhungen, durch Ver-
schleierung der Ereignisse des Vortages seine Stellung zu retten.
Dadurch wird die Bedeutung der Vergangenheit vollig verandert:
sie ist durchaus nicht absolut determinierend wie im *Kong Oedipus*,
sondern nur eine der Voraussetzungen des sich in dem Stuck
erhebenden und losenden Konfliktes. Adam hat sich schwer
vergangen, indem er Eva durch unredliche Ausnutzung seiner
Amtsgewalt seinen Zwecken gefugig machen wollte, er, der Richter,
der aus dem Gesetz seine Macht schopft und zu seiner Wahrung
eingesetzt ist, hat es gebrochen. Das Problem des Schauspiels ist
die Frage, ob das Gesetz in der Lage sein wird, sich gegenüber
seinem abtrunnigen Beamten wieder durchzusetzen oder nicht,
und die Entscheidung dieser Frage ist identisch mit der Enthüllung
der Geschehnisse der Vorzeit. Die Vergangenheit hat demgemass
keine schicksalsmassige Bedeutung, sondern ist nur das Objekt des
dramatischen Konflikts. Der Konflikt als solcher ist aber durchaus
gegenwartig, er wird vor den Augen des Zuschauers ausgetragen,
und daran andert die Tatsache nichts, dass sein Gegenstand ein
der Vergangenheit angehoriger Vorfall ist. Adam ist der Typ des
Beamten, der seine Macht skrupellos missbraucht und in den Dienst
seiner eigenen Ziele stellt, und diese seine Eigenschaft ist es, die
ihn in Gegensatz zum Gesetz bringt, wahrend die Tatsache, dass
ein bestimmter, kurze Zeit zuruckliegender Vorfall in dieser
Beziehung besonders kennzeichnend ist, mehr zufalliger Natur ist.
Ein Mensch wie Adam ist als Huter des Gesetzes unbrauchbar,
eine Inkompatibilitat, die latent schon immer vorhanden war, sich
aber erst durch sein Verhalten gegenüber Eva in einer positiven
Schuld konkretisiert hat. Die Frage, ob es Adam gelingen wird,
sich durchzuwinden, oder ob sein Vergehen offenbar wird, bildet
die Handlung des Lustspiels, und diese Frage wird umso span-
nender, als es lange Zeit den Anschein hat, als konnte sich Adam
durchsetzen und das Gesetz erfolgreich hintergehen, bis schliesslich

² *Heinrich von Kleist* (Berlin, 1924), S. 61 ff.

doch alles an den Tag kommt Unterwerfung unter das Schicksal ist das Leitmotiv des *König Oidipus*, Schuld und Sühne das des *Zerbrochenen Kruges*. Dass die Schuld in die Zeit vor Beginn des Dramas gelegt ist, ist dabei von geringer Bedeutung Das Drama erfordert seiner Natur nach eine möglichst konzentrierte Handlung, doch wäre es an sich denkbar, dass dasselbe Drama in mehrere Akte zerfiele, von denen der erste Adams Schuld zeigt, während die folgenden die langsame Selbstüberführung enthielten Es ist einzig und allein eine Frage dramatischer Technik, ob diese Ereignisse im Laufe des Dramas zur Sprache kommen oder direkt vorgeführt werden. Im *König Oidipus* ist dagegen von der Sühne für begangene Schuld keine Rede, denn Oidipus wird ja nicht für die Ermordung eines Menschen bestraft, was er allein mit Wissen und Willen verschuldet hat, sondern für Vätermord und Blutschande. Dass die Ereignisse in ferner Vergangenheit liegen, ist dabei ein wesentlicher Punkt des Dramas, indem dadurch der göttliche Ratschluss umso unverständlicher und grauenerregender für den Menschen wird, denn warum fordern die Gotter Bestrafung, nachdem sie die Greuel solange mit angesehen haben? Die Vergangenheit selber fällt also aus dem Bereich des Dramas heraus und wird nur aus Gründen transzendenter Natur plötzlich aktuell, während der *Zerbrochene Krug* in Wirklichkeit mit den Ereignissen der Vornacht beginnt, wenn sie auch nach oft gebrauchter Methode erst nachträglich offenbar werden.

Die Unterschiede zwischen den beiden Dramen scheinen so gross, dass es kaum verständlich ist, wie man sie als Schicksalstragödie und Schicksalskomödie miteinander in Parallele setzen kann. Wolff von Gordon begründet diese Auffassung folgendermassen:³

In der Traumszene fühlen wir mit Adam eine unbekannte Macht am Werke, die ihm sowohl den ahnungsvollen Traum schickt, als auch im Beginn die Verknüpfung ungünstiger Momente herbeiführt (Wunden, Perückenverlust, Revision und Gerichtstag).

Adam empfindet, dass hier etwas wirkt, wogegen er machtlos ist Der Zuschauer empfindet hier ebenfalls eine *unbekannte Macht*, die ihre Hand im Fadenspiel hat Dieselbe Macht empfinden wir aber auch an den andren beiden Punkten (gemeint sind Evas Gestandnisse) Eva sieht sich im Verlauf des Stückes gezwungen, Ruprecht zu entlasten, obgleich sie damit sich selbst schwer belastet, also gegen ihren Willen, und dann

³ Die dramatische Handlung in Sophokles' "*König Oidipus*" und Kleists "*Der zerbrochene Krug*" (Halle, 1926), S. 50 f

nennt sie, wieder gegen ihren ursprünglichen Vorsatz, Adam als den Täter

Die sozusagen unpersönlich geleitete Handlung ist also klar gegliedert es wird in Stufen von einer unbekannten Macht etwas aufgeheilt, was vorher dunkel war, die luckenlos zusammenhängenden Faden führen zu einer Klärung

Dass die von Gordon angeführten Momente nicht auf eine unbekannte Macht hinweisen, ergibt sich von selbst Adams Traum (v. 269 ff.) dürfte sich wohl einfacher als eine Folge bösen Gewissens erklären denn als das Wirken einer unbekannten Macht, und der Grund, warum ihn Kleist eingefügt hat, liegt darin, dass er die Schuld Adams von vornherein deutlich machen wollte, ohne sie ihn direkt aussprechen zu lassen Wunden, Perückenverlust, Revision und Gerichtstag sind die in der Exposition gegebenen Voraussetzungen, ohne die das Stück überhaupt nicht stattfinden konnte, sie ergeben sich aber ohne weiteres aus der Vorgeschichte. Zugegeben werden muss allerdings, dass Walter etwas den *deus ex machina* spielt ohne ihn wäre Adam vermutlich durchgeschlüpft, und die Tatsache, dass der Gerichtsrat gerade erscheint, ist, wie Gordon richtig sagt, ein zweiter Ausgangspunkt,⁴ der nichts mit der Vorgeschichte zu tun hat Aber wenn die Gestalt, die schliesslich alles zum guten wendet, auf eine höhere Macht hindeutete, dann hatte z. B. Dickens nur Schicksalsomane geschrieben Dass Eva die Wahrheit nicht gleich gesteht, hat ebenfalls nichts mit dem Schicksal zu tun, sondern ist ein unmittelbares Resultat des dramatischen Konfliktes Es muss sich in diesem Augenblick zeigen, ob Adams Macht trotz der Gegenwart eines Vertreters des Gesetzes gross genug ist, um Eva von einer ihn belastenden Aussage abzuhalten. Dass dies der Fall ist, beweist, wie gross die Gefahr für das angegriffene Gesetz war, aber beweist nichts von einem Schicksal. Der *Zerbrochene Krug* ist ein gewöhnliches Konfliktdrama, in dem einige Voraussetzungen aus technischen Gründen in die Vergangenheit zurückverlegt sind Dass der *König Oedipus* auf Kleist einen tiefgehenden Einfluss hatte, beweist sein *Robert Giuscard*, dessen Uebereinstimmung mit der griechischen Tragödie auf den ersten Blick offenbar ist. Der *Zerbrochene Krug* hat jedoch trotz Kleists Hinweis herzlich wenig damit zu tun, nur ein paar technische Aeusserlichkeiten sind in den beiden Dramen gleich.

The University of Texas,
Austin, Texas

HANS M. WOLFF

⁴ *Ibidem*, S. 50.

JAQUES' "SEVEN AGES" AND BARTHOLOMAEUS
ANGLICUS

Critics agree that the idea of dividing human life into periods, somewhat as Jaques does in *As You Like It*, had long been common, and was rather obviously derived from Classical, Hebrew, and Mediaeval thought. The proposed analogues, however, for Shakespeare's "seven ages" are either, like Proclus, Hippocrates, Isidore, and Geoffrey of Linn,¹ too remote for Shakespeare to have known at first hand,² or, like La Primaudaye's *French Academy* (1598), too different in their divisions and their treatments to be probable sources. C. Elliot Browne mentions as an analogue William Vaughan's *Directions for Health*,³ which, however, he dates 1602, two years too late for possible influence on *As You Like It*. Shakespeare's play seems to have been written in the late spring and early summer of 1600,⁴ and, as a matter of fact, an edition of the *Directions* came out in that year,⁵ and was entered in the *Stationers' Register* under the seventeenth of March. Thus the influence of Vaughan on Shakespeare is entirely possible; and, furthermore, his chapter "Of the Age of Man" divides life, as Shakespeare does, into seven parts. The similarity, however, seems to end here. His septenary division seems to arise purely from the astrological influence of the seven planets, and the brief description of each period of life in only one instance accords at all with Shakespeare's: the third age, he places under Venus, and declares it "prone to prodigality, gluttony, drunkenness, lechery and sundry kindes of vices" Even this is hardly a source for Shakespeare's "lover Sighing like a furnace."⁶ Some modern editors, following Henley, infer the existence of an old picture from which Shakespeare took the hint, and some, like Dover Wilson, content themselves with declaring that "The idea of the seven ages was a commonplace of the period."⁷ This last would

¹ See *As You Like It*, ed. Furness var., pp. 122 ff., and Herman Cohen, *TLS*, Jan. 30, 1930, p. 78.

² See the comment of Furness, p. 123 *passim*.

³ William Vaughan, *Directions for Health*, 7th ed., London, 1633, pp. 120-121.

⁴ See T. W. Baldwin, *MLN*, xxxix, 447.

⁵ See *S. T. C.*, No. 24612.

⁶ *As You Like It*, II, vii, 155-156.

⁷ *As You Like It*, ed. Quiller-Couch and Dover Wilson, p. 133.

be a simple solution if only it were true; but the popular science of the time generally did not divide life into seven parts. It usually made three main divisions, and the subdivisions under these are likely altogether to number five as in the case of the *Arcandam*⁸ or eight as in Lemnie⁹ and in Cuffe.¹⁰ In short, no satisfactory source for Jaques' "seven ages" has yet been found.

The thirteenth-century Franciscan Bartholomaeus Anglicus de Glanvilla was one of the most popular encyclopaedists of the Middle Ages, and his *De Proprietatibus Rerum* still enjoyed a vogue in the Renaissance, and was published several times in Latin and in English during the sixteenth century. In 1582, Stephen Batman brought out a translation with some revisions and additions, which "profoundly influenced popular thinking",¹¹ and a number of recent Shakespeare scholars, approaching the matter from different angles, have been led to believe that Shakespeare used the book. Although Isidore, who is repeatedly cited as the source, divides life into six parts, *Batman vppon Bartolome* gives seven,¹² and these rather clearly correspond to the seven ages in Shakespeare.

The first, [says Batman] is called *Infancia*, childhood without teeth, and lately got and borne, and dureth seauen months, and is yet full tender & soft and quauie and clammy. Therefore in that age a child needeth alwaye tender and softe keeping and feeding and nourishing. And child-hoode that breedeth teeth endureth and stretcheth seauen yeares. And such a Childe is called *Infans*, that is to understand, not speking, for he may not speake nor sound his words perfectly. for y^e teeth be not yet perfectly growen and set in order, as sayth Isid.

This is Shakespeare's "infant, Mewling and puking in his nurse's arms."

Batman continues:

Afterward commeth y^e second age y^t is called *Puericia*, childhood which dureth and lasteth other seuen years, that is to the ende of fourteene yeare and hath that name *Puericia* of *Pubertas*, or els of *Pupilla*, the black of y^e eye, for as yet the children are pure, as the blacke of y^e eye is, as *Isidore* sayth

⁸ *Most Excellent Booke of Arcandam*, London, 1592, sig. M2^r

⁹ L. Lemnie, *Touchstone of Complexions*, tr. Newton, London, 1581, leaves 29^r and 30^r

¹⁰ H. Cuffe, *Differences of the Ages of Mans Life*, London, 1607, pp. 116 ff.

¹¹ L. B. Wright, *Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England*, Chapel Hill, 1935, p. 553

¹² See Wright, 552 n., and T. B. Stroup, *P. Q.*, xvii, 355-6

¹³ *Batman vppon Bartolome*, London, 1582, Lib. VI, Cap. 1, leaf 70^r.

This is Shakespeare's "whining schoolboy"

And after that commeth the age that is called *Adolescentia*, the age of a young striplyng, & dureth the thirde seauenth yeare, that is, to the ende of one and twentie yeares, as it is sayd in *Viatico* but *Isidore* sayth, that it endureth to the fourth seauen yeares, that is to the ende of eight and twentie yeares. But Phisitions account this age to the ende of thirtie or fife and thirtie yeares. This age is called *Adolescentia*, for because it is full age to get children, as saith *Isidore* and able to burnish and increase, and hath might and strength

This is Shakespeare's "lover Sighing like a furnace."

The fourth age

is called *Iuuentus*, and this age is meane betweene all ages and therefore it is strongest, and lasteth as *Isidore* saith, to xlv or l yeares, and there endeth. And *Isidore* saith, this age *Iuuentus* hath that name of *Iuare*, that is to helpe for in that age a man is set in his full increasing, & therefore he is strong to helpe at neede

This is Shakespeare's soldier, "Jealous in honor, sudden and quick in quarrel"

The fifth is Senecta,

and is the middle age betweene the age that is called *Iuuentus*, & and the second age y^t *Isid* calleth heunes or sadnesse. This age accordeth to old men & sad, for to cal *Iuuentus* young. In this age olde men drawe from youth to the second age for such men be not in the second age, but their youth passeth, as saith *Isidore*

This is Shakespeare's gourmand-justice.

The sixth shows a definite decline.

some men suppose, y^t this age endeth at lxx yere, and some suppose that it endeth in no certaine nūber of yeares. But after these ages, all the other part of mans lyfe is accounted *Senectus*, or *Senum*, the second or last age

This is Shakespeare's "lean and slipper'd pantaloone" *Batman* vppon *Bartolome* then embarks upon a general discussion of old age, from which Shakespeare seems to have drawn a number of suggestions. This period shows "passing and fayling of wit . . . olde men doate . . . men that have colde bloud, be nice and fooles as men in whom hot bloud hath masterie, are wise and readye" Some become "mad" or at least childish.

Batman then proceeds to his seventh division:

The last part of age is called *Senum*, it is so called because it is the last end of age and of lyfe. This age bringeth with it manye domages, and

also profits good and euill, as sayth *Isidore* For it is wretched with feeblenesse and noye For manye euilles come, and sicknesse in age is noyous and sorrowfull, for two things there be, y^t destroy y^e strength of the bodie, sicknesse and age might and strength passeth and fayleth, flesh, fatnesse and fayrenesse is consumed and spent, the skinne riueth, the sinewes shrink, the bodye bendeth and crooketh, forme and shape is lost, and fairenesse of the body brought to nought, all these fayle in need

This is analogous to Shakespeare's description of dotage, "second childhood, and mere oblivion, Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything"

The present writer would not claim that in Jaques' seven ages Shakespeare was merely versifying *Batman vppon Bartolome*, but we have every reason to believe for other reasons that he read the book, the famous passage in *As You Like It* is similar as to the number of ages, as to their approximate division, and as to more than a few details that the dramatist developed and vivified when Shakespeare gave this speech to the learned and travelled Jaques, his mind naturally reverted to the standard treatise on the subject which he knew, and he filled out its pale and turgid phrases with telling realistic detail, quite as he added just such detail to vitalize and dramatize the pale and lifeless plots that he sometimes borrowed for his plays.

JOHN W. DRAPER

The West Virginia University

A TEXTUAL DILEMMA IN 1 HENRY IV

In the New Variorum edition of 1 *Henry IV* Professor Hemingway prints v, 1, 1-3 as follows:

King How bloudily the funne begins to peare
Aboue yon bufky hill, the day lookes pale
At his diftemprature

Of *bufky*, however, he notes that "the f in Q₁ is faint and broken, and may possibly be an l." The Cambridge editors unequivocally state that *bulky* is the reading of their copy and the word is *bulky* in the Ashbee and the Griggs facsimiles. A confirmation of Professor Hemingway's doubts may be found in the fact that it was not the custom of Elizabethan printers to set up a long-s before *k*. In Q₁ of this play, e. g., words like *ask* (I, III, 91; II, III, 83; II, IV,

59, 397, 398, IV, 11, 16), *mask* (III, 11, 136), *skull* (I, 11, 209; V, 1, 133), *skim* (II, 111, 30), *skin* (III, 111, 3), *skipping* (III, 11, 60), and *task* (IV, 1, 9, IV, 111, 92, V, 11, 51) are always printed with a short-s, while in *skumble fcamble* (III, 1, 154), printed thus, a nice distinction is made. And in Q₂, which undoubtedly reads *busky*, the s is short. If *busky* is the reading of Q₁ it must be a misprint.

But all the data available—I have never seen a copy of Q₁ itself—point to *bulky* as the correct reading. If so, it has received remarkably little attention. Every edition since Q₁ reads *busky*, and of a large number of modern editions which I have referred to, not one vouchsafes a reason for setting aside an intelligible reading in the only authoritative text of the play and only two give notice of a difference between Q₁ and Q₂ at this point. But if Q₁ reads *bulky*, the right of *busky* to stand in the text is by no means self-evident, however superior it may be in picturesqueness or as poetry. I shall not presume to decide between them, but I should like to state a few considerations that must be taken into account in making such a decision.

I note two facts which may have some bearing on the likelihood that *bulky* is the word that Shakespeare chose. The first is that *bulk* is a word well known to him, it occurs sixteen times in Bartlett's concordance and is sometimes used metaphorically of a thing of great size looming up before the speaker, as in *Tempest*, III, 1, 81, *Measure for Measure*, IV, IV, 24, *1 Henry IV*, V, 1, 62, *Henry VIII*, I, i, 55; *Timon*, V, 1, 63. Secondly, if *bulky* is what Shakespeare wrote, the word is his own invention. The earliest example of it quoted by the *NED* is seventy-five years later. As a neologism, *bulky* would certainly have had for Shakespeare and his contemporaries none of those prosaic connotations which it has for us.

If we assume that *bulky* is the reading of Q₁, that it is a mistake, and that *busky* is what Shakespeare wrote, then *busky* in Q₂ must be an authoritative correction. But an authoritative correction in a reissue of a Shakespearean quarto is a rare bird indeed. The opinion is virtually unanimous that Q₁ of this play is the only authoritative text; indeed, it is hard to think of any text printed from an earlier text in which the deviations from the earlier text are assumed to be authoritative (except, of course, certain texts in the first folio which seems to have been set up from quartos that had been used as prompt-books). In fact, the attribution of authority to

new readings in a mere reprint would drastically revise the whole of the current theory regarding the transmission of the text of Shakespeare.

On the other hand, if *busky* is not an authoritative correction it must be either a lucky accident, a slip of the compositor's which happened to produce an intelligible word, or a deliberate emendation made by some one, presumably in the printing-office, who was baffled by *bulky*—the word, according to the *NED.*, was very likely altogether strange to him—and who substituted a similar and more familiar word—some one, in short, who has most successfully improved Shakespeare. It is a nice dilemma, and deserves, I think, more attention than it has received.

MATTHIAS A. SHAABER

The University of Pennsylvania

SOME PLAYS BY GEORGE SOANE

Professor Allardyce Nicoll states in the introduction to the Hand-List of plays in his *History of Early Nineteenth Century Drama* that further research will identify the authors of many plays he has classified as of Unknown Authorship. Five of these seem to have been the work of George Soane (1790-1860)

- (1) *Grey the Collier* (Olympic Theatre, 3 November 1820), credited to Soane on the title pages of *Rob Roy* (Cumberland's British Theatre, Vol 36), *Zarah* (Cumberland's British Theatre, Vol 35), and *The Falls of Clyde* (French's Acting Edition, No 127)
- (2) *Jack's Alive* (Surrey Theatre, 27 March 1837), credited to Soane on the title page of *The Innkeeper's Daughter* (French's Acting Edition, No. 114)
- (3) *Luke Somerton* [Nicoll "Sumerton"] (Adelphi Theatre, 19 January 1836), credited to Soane in Duncombe's edition of the play (British Theatre, Vol 20) and on the title page of *The Innkeeper's Daughter* (French's Acting Edition, No 114)
- (4) *Othello* (Princess's Theatre, 20 March 1844),¹ credited to Soane on the title page of an octavo edition published by Fairbrother in London in 1844
- (5) *Undine, or the Spirit of the Waters* (Covent Garden Theatre,² 23

¹ A tragic opera in three acts, and in verse, translated and adapted by Soane from the Italian of the Marquis di Berio

² The source of this play is the romantic novel, *Undine, A Romance*, translated by Soane from the German of F H C de La Motte Fouqué, pub-

April 1821), credited to Soane on the title pages of American editions of the play (French's Acting Edition, No 202, and Sargent's Modern Standard Drama, Vol 26)

W. P. BOWMAN

*Hopkins Grammar School,
New Haven, Connecticut*

WILLIAM PAINTER AND THOMAS HEYWOOD

Since I have in the past given some laborious days to William Painter, the Elizabethan translator, I hope I may be pardoned for mentioning the frequent repetition of an erroneous list of the sources of his *Palace of Pleasure*. The fountainhead was Joseph Jacobs. Among countless mistakes he made Tacitus the source of Painter's tale of Zenobia, who flourished a century and a half later than the historian. Jacobs's list was reproduced in the *DNB*. I gave a correct list of the sources of Painter's classical tales in the *JEGP.*, xxiii (1924), 331 ff, and summarized the chief facts in my *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition* (1932). However, the erroneous list has been relied upon, or rehearsed in full, by Mr. Peter Haworth, *An Elizabethan Story-Book*, 1928, by the late Hamish Miles, in the Cresset Press edition of Painter, 1929, by Mr. E. J. O'Brien, *Elizabethan Tales*, 1937, and by Professor De Sola Pinto, *The English Renaissance*, 1938. In the second volume (1929) of his *History of the English Novel*, Dr Baker lists, apparently as ultimate sources of Painter's classical tales, six correct names and seven new wrong ones. Doubtless it is not a great matter, but if Painter is worth all this attention he ought not to diag at each remove a lengthening chain of error.

While in the bibliographical mood I may add another item. The modernization of Lydgate called *The Life and Death of Hector* (1614) is still repeatedly ascribed to Thomas Heywood and unfortunately that attribution has received the *imprimatur* of Dr. Bergen in the latest volume of his edition of Lydgate's *Troy Book*. The quite nebulous case for Heywood's authorship of this crude work

lished in 1818 in an octavo edition by Simpkin in London, and soon considered "more popular in England than any other foreign work, even *Faust*" (*European Magazine*, lxxix, 443)

has been disposed of by Professor Tatlock, *PMLA.*, xxx, 691 ff., Dr A. M. Clark, *TLS.*, Oct 2, 1924, p 612, and *Thomas Heywood*, pp 340-41, and C. A. Rouse, *PMLA*, XLIII, 779 ff

Harvard University

DOUGLAS BUSH

AN INTERPRETATION OF DONNE'S TENTH ELEGY

In the 1633 edition of Donne's *Poems*, Elegy X is entitled simply "Elegie," and all manuscripts but one either follow this simple title or else omit a title altogether. The 1635 edition of the *Poems*, which added descriptive titles to most of the elegies, labels Elegy X "The Dreame" Finally, Stowe MS 961 (Grierson, S96), dated after 1630, has the interesting variant title "The Picture" The titles to the elegies in the 1635 edition seem to represent nothing more than the editor's guesses based on the poems' contents. Even considering the fact that, as Grierson states, "the tenor of [Elegy X] is somewhat obscure," the 1635 editor made an especially bad guess here, for the poem makes nonsense if "Image of her whom I love" is supposed to represent the appearance of the lady in a dream. Consequently, in his note to this Elegy, Grierson leans toward the title of the single manuscript.

The "Image of her whom I love," addressed in the first eight lines, seems to be a picture When that is gone and reason with it, fantasy and dreams come to the lover's aid (ll 9-20) But the tenor of the poem is somewhat obscure, the picture is addressed in terms that could hardly be strengthened if the lady herself were present ¹

But as Mr. Grierson recognizes, there are several difficulties in interpreting the Elegy as addressed to a picture. It is rather odd for the poet to say that he loves the picture better than the woman herself, especially since the statement is never explained. One may also enquire why "reason" is supposed to depart with the picture, since the picture can have no inhibiting effects on Donne's phantasies in sleep. And finally, at the end of the poem, why should the picture be compared to human life as passing away too fast?

If we discard the two suggested titles, which are only unauthorized guesses by persons no more competent than ourselves to

¹H. J. C. Grierson, *The Poems of John Donne*, II, 76

judge, and examine the Elegy with a fresh mind, it is possible, I believe, to solve the riddle of its interpretation. The Elegy begins,

Image of her whom I love, more than she,
Whose faire impression in my faithfull heart,
Makes mee her *Medall*, and makes her love mee,
As Kings do coyne, to which their stamps impart
The value goe, and take my heart from hence,
Which now is growne too great and good for me
Honours oppresse weak spirits, and our sense
Strong objects dull, the more, the lesse wee see

Donne was especially fond, as in *The Extasie*, of separating the body from the soul and considering each as a sensuously perceived entity. This almost concretely visualized dualism is repeated in *Air and Angels*, but more specifically in *The Undertaking*, where his loved one's physical beauty is called her "oldest clothes" and is separated as one distinct entity from her inner self, the sum of all her qualities which make her ideal Woman, that "Vertue" which he sees "attr'd in woman." It is something closely approaching this latter separation of two degrees of reality which I believe is represented in the Elegy, but here applied especially to the Platonic ideal of love. Thus I take "Image" as the Platonic "fairer forme" represented in Spenser's *Hymne in Honour of Love*, which "the refyned mynd doth newly fashion" from "sordid baseness," and "which now doth dwell In his high thought, that would it selfe excell." According to Spenser, this "image printing in his deepest wit, He thereon feeds his hungrie fantasy. . . . Thereon his mynd affixed wholly is"

His harts enshrined saint, his heauens queene,
Fairer then fairest, in his fayning eye,
Whose sole aspect he counts felicitye

The identity of symbols is obvious. The "she" of the first line must represent the lady's beautiful exterior, her "oldest clothes" of "colour . . . and skinne", more precisely, the everyday woman before she became of "fairer forme" by elevation to the Platonic pedestal. The proper grammatical reference for "Whose" in line 2 presents a problem. If we are to follow the Spenserian imagery (partially corroborated by the punctuation of the *Elegy*), "Whose" refers to the "Image," or Platonic woman, which "printing in his deepest wit" has made his heart (*i. e.*, Donne himself) of the same

substance or value as her love. On the other hand, less violence is done to normal grammatical structure if "Whose" refers to "she," with the possible meaning that as the first step in the Platonic adoration her beautiful exterior had already conquered his heart before he loved her "fairer forme," or Image. The word "love" in line 3 is a noun, "do" in line 4 apparently refers to the act of identification.

Donne then finds that the Platonic ideal is too elevated for the earthly desires which still possess him, and begs the Image—of course identified with the lady—to depart. Absent, he can enjoy her in his imagination unhampered by their Platonic relationship

When you are gone, and *Reason* gone with you,
Then *Fantasie* is Queene and Soule, and all,
She can present joyes meaner then you do,
Convenient, and more proportionall

He describes the pleasures of possessing her in his dreams, which he prefers to the Reason which makes him know that she would refuse him in real life. Finally, with a typical Donne turn he reverses himself and begs her

But dearest heart, and dearer image stay,
Alas, true joyes at best are *dreame* enough,
Though you stay here you passe too fast away
For even at first lifes *Taper* is a snuffe
Fill'd with her love, may I be rather grown
Mad with much *heart*, then *ideott* with none

Life is not short enough, he decides, for him fully to enjoy her "Image," for age takes away beauty and then life.

This interpretation not only removes all the difficulties encountered if "Image" means a portrait of his lady, but it also deepens the meaning of the poem and links it firmly to the Platonic verses addressed to his two patronesses, Magadalen Herbert and the Countess of Bedford. In the same playful tone as *The Blossom* it celebrates a proposed parting, and with somewhat the same imagery, the same amorous compliments are provided as in *Twickenham Garden*; and the same complimentary hopeless love exhibited as in *The Primrose*.

FREDSON T. BOWERS

University of Virginia

AN OBSCURE LINE IN BRANT'S *NARRENSCHIFF*

Chapter Seventy-four of Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff* contains several difficult passages which have lacked a successful interpretation. In one particular instance, Zarncke, Goedeke, and Bobertag, the editors of the three standard editions of the *Narrenschiff*, are unable to agree regarding the correct meaning

The selection containing the controversial line follows

- 6 "Des glich hund, vogel, vaderspil
7 Bringt als kein nutz und kostet vil" ¹

In line six occurs the most obscure part of this entire chapter devoted to the hunt. Bobertag and Zarncke print the line as it was in the *Originalausgabe* of Basel, in 1494: "Des glich hund, vogel, vaderspil." ² The comma between *hund* and *vogel* is of some importance, for, if omitted, it changes the interpretation of the line considerably. Goedeke actually does omit it in his edition, as "Des glich hundvogel, vaderspil . . ." ³ He admits that the *Originalausgabe* has the comma, but defends himself by referring back to Chapter Forty-four, line one, where he also writes erroneously "wer vogelhund in kirchen furt . . ." ⁴ In a note to this line, Goedeke remarks "[Die Originalausgabe] schreibt vogel, hund . . . da fast nur vom Habicht die Rede ist, gilt der Strich als Bindestrich. Vogelhund ist Jagdvogel, Federspil." ⁵ The word *Vogelhund* does exist and might apply here, but "vogel, hund" fits better into the above passage, because the following lines leave no doubt that Brant is talking of both birds and dogs. Goedeke has even less reason for deleting the comma between *hund* and *vogel* in Chapter Seventy-four, since *hundvogel* certainly does not agree with the preceding or following words. Thus, the line is correctly translated by Bobertag "Desgleichen Hunde und dazu Vogel. . . ." ⁶

The correct interpretation of *vaderspil* also presents a problem

¹ F. Bobertag, *Sebastian Brants Narrenschiff*, Berlin und Stuttgart, 1889, p. 197, Anmerkungen

² Cf., *ibid.*, p. 197, and Friedrich Zarncke, *Sebastian Brants Narrenschiff*, Leipzig, 1854, Ch. 74

³ K. Goedeke, *Das Narrenschiff von Sebastian Brant*, Leipzig, 1872, p. 144

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 80

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 80

⁶ Bobertag, *op. cit.*, p. 197

without a satisfactory solution. Zarncke and Bobertag favor the meaning, falcon, while Goedeke maintains that "Federspiel ist Kampf des Geflügels."⁷ In Grimms' *Wörterbuch*⁸ there are three primary and several secondary meanings for the word. The first is "die Lust der Vogeljagd oder auch . . . Streit und Schauspiel." Grimm lists two examples for this meaning, while under the heading, falcon, he lists fourteen Middle High German examples. It appears, however, that the meaning, falcon, is encountered less frequently after the seventeenth century. The third connotation is a more technical hunting term meaning "feathers tied together and fastened to a line," an apparatus which was employed as a decoy. It is safe to discard this latter definition, which is found mainly in books dealing specifically with the technique of falconry. Benecke's *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch* lists an even greater number of quotations than does Grimm favoring the meaning, falcon, or "zur Jagd abgerichteter Vogel."⁹

Of the sources consulted, only Grimm and Benecke were logical enough to be of any help, the latter work even lists the passage under examination here. To arrive at a conclusion, one must first accept two general meanings current in the literature of Brant's time. The connotation, falcon, is much more prevalent than falconry, or "bird-play." Since this is the case, and since also Geiler von Kaisersberg, who was of the same period and district as Brant, uses the term to mean falcon,¹⁰ there seems to be little doubt that the line should be translated "Desgleichen Hunde, und dazu Vogel, (wie) Falken . . ."

EDGAR C. CUMINGS

University of Rochester

A NOTE ON LINE 1514 OF THE *HELIAND*

The Cotton manuscript of the Old Saxon *Heliand* reads in the second half of line 1514 as follows *bethu sculun gimithan*

⁷ Goedeke, *op cit*, p 144.

⁸ J. and W. Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig, 1854, III, p 1407 f

⁹ Benecke, Müller, Zarncke, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig, 1866, II, 2, pp 503-504

¹⁰ J. Scheible, *Sebastian Brants Narrenschiff mit Geilers von Kaisersberg Predigten darüber*, Stuttgart, 1845, p 627 f

filo Erlos eth uuordo. Piper construed the *gi* of *gimithan* as the plural of the personal pronoun of the second person. Sievers also prints it as an independent word but brackets it [*gi*]*mithan*. Behaghel simply omits the *gi*, which is in accordance with the Munich manuscript *Bethu sculun midan filuerlos eduuordo*

This *gi* is most probably not the pronoun at all but the prefix *gi-*, as it is also written in the Cotton MS. It is a well-known fact that the modal auxiliaries have a tendency to use the so-called perfective form of the dependent infinitive as. *that ic eu gitellhan mag* 405, *Ic eu an uuatara scal gidopian* 882, *the maht godes, the ik gifrummien scal* 3103, *gi sculun mi gesurkan* 4667, *that sculum gi arbedries so filu githolon* 1889, 1895, 3527, 4894 (cf. 1351, 2604, 2933, 3181, 3382, 4143, 4431, 5015, 5216), *than sea is thena endr sculun gusehan* 1356, etc. As a matter of fact a large number of infinitives with *gi-* are found only after a modal auxiliary, particularly after *mugan* (*gi-formon*, *gi-frëson*, *gi-frôðrian*, *gi-lettian*, *gi-lônon*, *gi-scînan*, *gi-scriðan*, *gi-thenkian*, *gi-thîhan*, *gi-thringan*, *gi-uuardon*, *gi-uuendian*, *gi-uuîtnon*, *gi-uurêðrian*). In a number of instances one manuscript has the *gi-* prefix and the other does not 889 *gidopean* M—*dopan* C, 4197 *gifrummien* M—*frummian* C, 4785 *gefrummien* M—*frû* | *mean* C, 2753 *gequeden* M—*quethan* C, 4302 *giseggian* M—*seggian* C, 405 *gtellean* M—*tellhan* C, 2671, 3619, 4280 *getellien* M—*tellhan* C 2093, 4218 *horien* M—*gihorian* C, 164 *sprekan* M—*gisprekean* C, 184 *sprekan* M—*gisprecan* C, 229 *sprecan* M—*gisprekan* C, 4576 *surkan* M—*gesurcan* C; 4376 *thenkean* M—*gethenkean* C. In line 2513M the manuscript has *uuntoga uuargean*, whereas C has *uuntiu gnuuarogan*. The M-reading is a scribal error, the *ga-* (the vowel has probably been assimilated to the following *a*, cf. *godar* 219C; *gobod* 3398C, *goboran* 5267C) has been wrongly joined to the preceding word. Of course the instrumental ending of *uunt* has been tampered with (only the *a*-stems have frequently *o*, cf. Gallée, *Altsachs Gramm.*, § 297, 4). In as much as there is frequently an omission or addition of the prefix in infinitives, especially after modal auxiliaries, as the above examples show, it is not unreasonable to suppose that *gimithan* in C 1514 may be a correct form, and that we are not privileged to separate the *gi-* from the verb and consider it a pronoun

EDWARD H. SEHRT

George Washington University

AN ITALO-GERMAN FAUSTSPLITTER OF 1621

Johannes Thulius (1590-1630),¹ physician and professor of rhetoric in the University of Freiburg i. Br. and later in the University of Padua,² in his voluminous commentary on the immensely popular *Emblemata* of Andrea Alciato (1492-1550),³ has the following noteworthy passage on Faust ⁴

Apud nos quoque Germanos adhuc notum est, inter praestigiatōres & magos, qui patrum nostrorum memoria innotuerunt, celebre nomen, propter mirificas imposturas & fascinationes diabolicas, adeptum fuisse Ioannem Faustum Kundlingensem, qui Cracouiae magiam didicerat, adeo ut ex plebe nostratum propemodum nullus reperiatur, qui non aliquod documentum eius artis commemorare possit, illique eadem ludibria, quae modo de mago Bohemo (1 e Zyto magus) diximus, ascribantur, ut libello Germanico idiomate vulgato patet Quemadmodum autem horum praestigiatorum vita similis fuit, ita uterque horrendo modo in viuis esse desijt Faustus enim, ut fertur, & à Wiero⁵ lib 2 cap 4 recensetur, in pago Ducatus Wirtembergici inuentus fuit iuxta lectum mortuus, inuersa facie, & domo praeecedenti nocte media quassata Sic periijt infaustus Faustus

This passage was unknown to A. Tille⁶ and A. Kippenberg⁷ and is all the more interesting as it bears direct witness to the extent of the vogue which the Faust legend had in Germany in the beginning of the seventeenth century Moreover, according to Tille's list, it may well be the earliest mention of Faust in a work connected with Italian literature and printed in Italy.

Hunter College

ARPAD STEINER

¹ Some data on Thulius's life and works are found in *Grosses Vollständiges Universal Lexikon Aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, Leipzig und Halle, 1745, XLIII, 1801-1802

² Thulius's biographical data given by P. E. Viard, *André Alciato (1492-1550)*, Paris, 1926, p. 323, are incorrect

³ For recent literature on Alciato, cf. J. G. Fucilla, 'De Morte et Amore,' *Philological Quarterly*, XIV (1935), 97

⁴ *Andreae Alciati Emblemata Cum Commentariis*. opera et vigilis Ioannis Thulii Mariaemontani Tirol etc., Patavij, typis Pauli Frambotti, 1661, p. 708 This edition is nearly identical with that of 1621, cf. H. Green, *Andrea Alciato and His Books of Emblems*, London, 1872, p. 266

⁵ Joannes Wierus, *De Praestigis Daemonum*, Basileae, 1568, p. 142, reprinted in A. Tille, *Die Faustsplitter in der Literatur des sechzehnten bis achtzehnten Jahrhunderts nach den ältesten Quellen*, Berlin, 1900, p. 21

⁶ *Op cit*

⁷ *Jahrbuch der Sammlung Kippenberg*, I (1921), 321 ff., IV (1924), 282 ff.; VIII (1930), 249 ff., IX (1931), 198 ff

HEYSE, SCHOTT AND FONTANE

Who was the friend that insisted on the omission of the *Judin* from Fontane's collection of poems? And who was the "Munchener Freund" backing up that move? The writer is indebted to Prof Julius Petersen (University of Berlin) and Dr Kurt Lewent for valuable hints leading to the elucidation of these questions which had to be left unanswered in a previous article on Fontane's German version of "The Jew's Daughter" (*MLN*, April, 1938, p 282-287) Full responsibility for the interpretation of those suggestions is naturally assumed After Fontane's audience with King Max in 1859, the circle of his Munich friends (Geibel, Grosse, Heyse, Lugg, Riehl, Schack, Sybel, von der Tann, Windscheid) had gradually melted away through death, departure and estrangement until, in 1892, just one intimate remained Paul Heyse. Cogent inner evidence strengthens the inference that none else but Heyse was the "Munchener Freund." Throughout the Fontane-Heyse correspondence runs an untiring exchange of frank mutual criticism. It is true that Heyse was enthusiastic about Fontane's own ballads, but he went out of his way to call only *a few* of Fontane's translations from Percy "meisterhaft",¹ this indicates that he had objections to a considerable number of others, which, unfortunately, he does not name Heyse, the son of Julie Saaling, the author of *Maria von Magdala*, the horrified opponent of youthful naturalism which found an understanding friend in Fontane, could not but object to Fontane's all too sanguinary ballad, which seemed to demonstrate the patent lack of the quality for which Heyse looked in vain in German literature "künstlerischer Takt."² Heyse's instinctive aversion to the ugly and coarse had made him deeply suspicious of naturalism. In 1892, moreover, amidst naturalism's sweeping rise and Stocker's swelling movement, Heyse, being equally adverse to both extremes, had even weightier reasons for supporting the démarche of a third person aiming at the removal of the shocking ballad.

¹ *Der Briefwechsel von Th Fontane und Paul Heyse* Weltgeist-Bucher, Berlin, 1929, p 74 "Seine Balladen aber, seine 'Manner und Helden,' seine Bearbeitung einzelner Sachen aus Percys Sammlung sind meisterhaft"

² *Paul Heyse, Jugenderinnerungen und Bekenntnisse* W Hertz, Berlin, 1900, p 345

But who was this third person? The hitherto unpublished letter leaves the impression that the addressee was neither a resident of Berlin nor of Munich. Considering that Heyse was the "Munchener Freund," and that therefore the addressee must have had close connexions with both Heyse and Fontane, we come upon the journalist and Lessing-scholar Sigmund (Siegmund) Schott of Frankfurt a. M., not to be mistaken for his contemporary namesake, the Stuttgart political writer who died in 1895. Schott, a busy contributor to the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, the *Frankfurter Beobachter*, the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, the *Revue internationale* and other papers and magazines, reviewed regularly Fontane's recent works and we possess two letters in which Fontane thanks him very cordially for excellent reviews of his *Poggenpuhls* and *Von Zwanzig bis Dreissig*.³ Gottfried Keller, who sat up on his death bed to write to Schott the last letter of his life, describes him as a "geistreichen und gewandt-tatigen Mann."⁴ Schott's suggestion could not be immaterial to the Berlin poet who had reason to feel obliged to him. Judging from the fact that, a few years previously (in 1885), Schott had similarly troubled Keller by objecting to a detail in a work by the Swiss which, like Fontane's ballad, had been composed decades before,⁵ it appears that the Frankfurt writer liked to single out and question more or less significant details picked out from works which had been written many years earlier. Thus, it is at least quite probable that it was Schott who, with Heyse's approval, suggested and obtained the elimination of Fontane's ill-fated translation of the gruesome ballad in Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*.

HENRY H. REMAK

Indiana University

HOUSMAN'S LAST POEMS, XXX AND HEINE'S LYRISCHES INTERMEZZO, 62.

An instance of influence from Heine's *Buch der Lieder* upon A. E. Housman is the arresting parallel between the first two quatrains of *Last Poems*, XXX ("Sinner's Rue") and the eight

³Th Fontane, *Gesammelte Werke* F. Fontane, Berlin, 1905-1912 2 Serie, XI, 418, 469

⁴Gottfried Keller, *Briefe* Bibl Institut, Leipzig, no date, p 467-468

⁵Gottfried Keller, *Briefe und Tagebücher* J G Cotta, 1919, III, 502

lines which make up *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, 62.¹ Compare Housman's opening stanza with Heine's closing lines:

I walked alone and thinking,	Am Kreuzweg stand ich und
And faint the nightwind blew	seufzte,
And stirred on mounds at crossways	Die Nacht war kalt und stumm
The flower of sinner's rue	Im Mondschein bewegte sich lang-
	sam
	Die Armesunderblum'.

While the first lines of "Sinner's Rue" thus correspond to the second (and final) quatrain of the Heine lyric, Housman's second quatrain offers an even closer parallel to Heine's first:

Where the roads part they bury	Am Kreuzweg wird begraben,
Him that his own hand slays,	Wer selber sich brachte um;
And so the weed of sorrow	Dort wachst eine blaue Blume,
Springs at the four cross ways	Die Armesunderblum'.

Housman appears to have given, if not a translation, certainly (and despite rhythmic variations) an excellent paraphrase of Heine's content.

In the third stanza the "flower of sinner's rue" is seen to be identical in color with the *Armesunderblume*

By night I plucked it hueless,
When morning broke 'twas blue

Here the parallel ends, for however definitely Heine's lines may have served Housman as a point of departure, in the remainder of his poem he elaborated his theme far beyond the original frame.

Further point is lent to the above observations by A E Housman's own words regarding "the influences affecting his poems"

¹ After these observations of some years' standing had already gone to press, my attention was called by Miss Theresa M Fein of the University of Wisconsin to John Sparrow's article on "Echoes in the Poetry of A E Housman" (*Nineteenth Century*, Feb 1934, vol 115, pp 243-256) The writer feels, however, that the present structural-analytical viewpoint can only enhance Mr Sparrow's aperçu, which was confined to commenting on a similarity of setting in our two poems (*loc cit*, p 254 f), while observing in addition an interesting echo of Heine's *Die Ilse*, stanza 5, in *Last Poems XIX*, stanza 6 A further consideration in publishing my notes is the appearance meanwhile of new evidence substantiating the connection between the two poets (s. below)

(specifically in the earlier *Shropshire Lad*). He lists as the "chief sources of which I am conscious . . . Shakespeare's songs, the Scottish Border ballads, and Heine"²

HERMAN SALINGER

The University of Wisconsin

TOBLER-LOMMATZSCH CHIEF (CHAYER)

The listing of *chief* (*chayer*), translated by *Hohle*, as a *hapax*, in the Tobler-Lommatzsch dictionary,¹ should be corrected in accordance with Tobler's own earlier interpretation of the passage there cited from the *fabliau La Veuve*

Pitiet de cul trait leus de chief²

Tobler showed that we have in this verse of the *fabliau* a proverb of *Le Proverbe au vilain*.³

Pitiez de cul trait lentes de chief

Leus should be emended to read *lens*, another and earlier form of *lentes* (*lente* = nit, louse egg). *Lens* is attested in *Le Couronnement de Renard*,⁴ but is not listed in Godefroy or La Curne

Tobler's interpretation is confirmed by the reading of this verse

² As quoted in *A E H Some Poems, Some Letters and a Personal Memoir by his Brother Laurence Housman*, London, Jonathan Cape, 1937 (p 71 et seq) See also A E Housman's letter of 6 May 1928 (*op cit*, p 199) "The influence of Heine is evident in *A Shropshire Lad*"

¹ Tobler-Lommatzsch, *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, II, 390, 12

² As printed in A Scheler, *Trouveres belges du XII^e au XIV^e siècle*, Bruxelles, 1876, I, 241, v 486 Scheler gives no explanation of the verse, cf p 348 Scheler's text is reprinted without commentary by Montaiglon et Raynaud, *Recueil général des fabliaux*, Paris, II, 213 The interpretation of this verse in the T-L dictionary seems to be "sexual impulse brings wolves out of their holes or dens," since *chief* is there associated with *chayer* (L *cavare*)

³ A Tobler, *Le Proverbe au vilain*, Leipzig, 1895, p 92, no 221, cf also his note on p 172 I have found no other examples of this curious proverb It is cited by J Morawski, *Proverbes français*, CFMA, 1925, p 60, no 1640, but the reference is to *Le Proverbe au vilain*

⁴ A. Foulet, *Le Couronnement de Renard* (Elliott Monographs, XXIV), Princeton, 1924, verse 1977

of *La Veuve* in the unedited Middleton MS ⁵ which has the singular form *lent* (for *leus*)

- 556 Dont a il tot a son devis
 Et les poisçons et les oiseaus,
 Dont est il sire et damoiseaus,
Dont est il puiés et lavés
 560 Et molt soventes fois gravés,
 Car je vos di bien de recief
 562 Pités de cul trait lent de cief

Verses 559-560 of this passage of the Middleton text are not found in the published version and form a fitting introduction to the proverb in verse 562. The heroine had quarreled with her husband over various matters and had received a severe beating. Soon after, they had resumed marital relations and she does her utmost to show him her affection. The proverb therefore sums up the context: "Sexual desire imposes upon her the most meticulous care regarding the details of regaining her husband's love."

The above passage confirms the second occurrence of *lent*, *lens* (modern *lente*) derived from *L lendum*, which still survives in the Picard and Walloon patois *lẽ* ⁶. *Chief* in the passage has therefore its ordinary meaning of *head* and the T-L dictionary article *chief* (*cavare*) is to be discarded.

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

Bowdoin College

PHENAGLING

I must some time have seen the word in print, for the picture in memory begins with *ph*, though *f* would do as well, *fenagling*, *fenagle*.

Several days ago, reviewing Byron for lecture purposes, I paused over the fifth line of stanza XI in the first canto of *Don Juan*,

For her Fenagle's were an useless art,
 And he himself obliged to shut up shop—he

⁵ Folio 341 recto, col b of the MS described on pp 233 f of the *Report of the Manuscripts preserved at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire (Historical Manuscripts Commission)*, Hereford, 1911

⁶ W Meyer-Lubke, *Rom Etym Worterb*, 3rd ed, no 4978

Could never make a memory so fine as
That which adorn'd the brain of Donna Inez

Byron was with one hand praising the lady extravagantly, and with the other turning all into lampooning. *Fine-à-gle*, accent on the middle syllable for scansion. But Byron would not have said *Fine*, he anglicized foreign names. *Juan new one· true one Duan through one, Seville devil, Cuvier must err.* Then *Fee-na-gle. Fee-na-gle?* That's the colloquial word I heard when I was a boy in the Carolinas, *fenagle, phenagling*.

A hasty expedition to *DNB. Fenagle*, 1765(?) - 1819, that's the man, the article contains matter (no need to repeat it here) that lends support to the conjectured etymology. A rapid search through the dictionaries on the neighboring shelves, all fail me—no such word—save one, the 1935 *International*; in its bottom-of-the page supplement, "*phenagle*, see *fainagle*." (The dictionary man doesn't know how to spell) *Fainagle, finagle*—definition? Hm, not so good, not the meaning I grew up with, *to wit*, fuss and feathers over a small matter with fakery in it, a lackadaisical effort to sell a bargain, a small bargain. Etymology?—he tries to connect the word with *feign*. Pretty weak; improbable. My conjecture sounds more likely. F & W *New Standard* (1937)? Yes, lists *finagle*, with a satisfactory definition but no etymology.

At dinner time I recounted my scouting adventure to my summer's table-mate, Dr. Harold Whitehall, expert etymologist. "*Fenagle!*" The dictionary-makers have sought long and hard for the etymology of that word. Yes. It sounds as if you may be right. Send an account of it to *Modern Language Notes*."

Fenagle may be another in the list of Don Juan's natural sons. More likely, it is the off-spring of the lampooning, local hit slang-inventiveness of music-hall taste, in England, 1805-1820, the "popular" pronunciation of the foreign lecturer's name would have been "*Fee-ná-gle*."

The etymology *fenagle (finagle) < Fenagle* is submitted to the etymologists, for their perpension.

R. H. GRIFFITH

The University of Texas

REVIEWS

The Works of Edmund Spenser A Variorum Edition The Faerie Queene, Books Six and Seven Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD, FREDERICK MORGAN PADELDFORD, RAY HEFFNER, JAMES G. McMANAWAY, DOROTHY E. MASON, and BRENTS STIRLING Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. xii + 508 \$6.00.

With this volume, containing Book VI and a Canto ascribed here to a Book VII, the Variorum Edition of *The Faerie Queene* is brought to a close. The features are those of the previous volumes,—a beautifully printed text, a variorum commentary somewhat bewildering in its variorum character, the innumerable suggestions of sources and parallels, a series of Appendixes which form the most valuable and interesting part of the editorial work. These last include discussions of the Plan and Conduct of Book VI, the Prototype of Sir Calidore, Sources and similarly for Book VII appendixes on Sources and Philosophical Significance, as well as on the Date of the Cantos. There is also a Textual Appendix recording variants followed by critical notes on the text. The volume closes with a Note on the Punctuation of the *Faerie Queene*. It might have been worth while to add a brief note on the spelling, for Spenser seems to have taken surely unusual care to make his rhymes appeal to the eye as well as the ear.

The chief fresh source on which the editors have drawn in the appendixes is Mr. C. S. Lewis's *The Allegory of Love*, Oxford, 1936. It is a pity that this had not been available for a full editorial discussion of Mr. Lewis's challenging and to my mind, even if one does not accept his views entirely, illuminating criticism. My chief criticism would be that, by setting aside the historical and personal element in the allegory and concentrating on the ethical and religious, Mr. Lewis has at times brought out more clearly what was Spenser's intention than what he actually succeeded in conveying of this serious significance. If it be true to say that the pastoral cantos in the sixth book are not a digression but form the core of the allegory on courtesy, and also that Spenser's courtesy is not connected with the court and noble blood, it is very difficult, as other critics here point out, to harmonize this with all that Spenser has to say about noble blood or with the comparison which he institutes and emphasizes between the knightly Calidore and the peasant Coridon. All the courteous knights and ladies are in the end discovered to be of noble blood as was customary in mediaeval romances. Nevertheless in the appendix to the fragment on muta-

bility it would have been well, I think, to set over against the dogmatic criticism of Saurat and other authors cited Mr Lewis's reading of Spenser's teaching regarding the mutable and the eternal "The enemies of Mutability are first the gods and then Nature. Taken together they represent the Divine order in the Universe" etc It is a bold reading and other critics have derived a very different impression from these strange and intensely personal stanzas.

For the personal note in these two Books is strong. Indeed, to one less intent than Mr Lewis in the defence of Spenser as a moral teacher many of the illustrations of courtesy and its opposite seem somewhat obvious, and moreover blend the not always congruous codes of Christian ethics and those of the courts of love

Of the political element which to my mind, despite the quite justifiable claims of Miss Spens and Mr. Lewis for the deeper element in Spenser's thought, does complicate and not a little obscure the ethical, there is little in this book. It is in the fifth Book on justice that this is most obvious where, though one may find a defensible significance in Spenser's thought, yet justice, as administered by Lord Gray of Wilton in Ireland, is looked at from a very British point of view, the Brigands in this book who carry off Pastorella are suggested, I suspect, by Irish experiences. Otherwise there are only two important questions of a political kind,—the sources of the Blatant Beast and the prototype of Sir Calidore Ben Jonson told Drummond that in the former Spenser was aiming a shaft at the Puritans. Mr Merritt Y. Hughes (Appendix III) contends very justly for a wider application, to the general prevalence of slander in the political and religious warfare of the day. The Beast is only too vigorously alive today in the Press of whole countries and sections of the Press of every country.

Sir Calidore has been traditionally accepted as a tribute to Sir Philip Sidney. That may be true, and yet there is something to be said for Mr. Rowe's contention in Appendix II that Essex was, shall we say *also*, in Spenser's mind. Sidney was dead, Essex was alive, and Spenser, no more than any other poet of the day, could afford to neglect the possibility of active patronage In one of the Dedicatory Sonnets, Essex is promised

more famous memory
Of thine heroic parts

Courtesy was a noted quality in the references to Essex. A poem in a manuscript which I have read in the British Museum contrasts the haughtiness and arrogance of Raleigh with the courtesy of Essex even toward humble people

But the personal is the dominant note in what every critic recognizes as the gem of the sixth book, the description in Canto x of the Graces dancing around Colin's love, a compliment to the lady

for whom the Epithalamion was written, though here again Mr. Lewis has much that is of interest to say on the meaning of the Graces in their relation to Colin Clout. The personal note of feeling is also very audible in the fragment which the editors have chosen to accept as a portion of an unfinished Book VII, the Canto on Mutability. In this fragment perhaps intended for a book on Constancy, an element in Aristotle's conception of Courage, Spenser has left another of those freely invented and developed pageants such as the Garden of Adonis, with digressions where allegory is forgotten, here the story of Molanna and Faunus which recalls the wedding of Thames and Medway. Spenser as a poet is never more purely delightful than when he lets his fancy swing out in this emancipated fashion as again in the pageant of the seasons and months, especially when the whole is colored by his own deepest feeling. The sigh with which the fragment concludes in the two stanzas headed Canto VIII is very characteristic of that mood of disappointment which will reappear in some of the minor poems that are to constitute the concluding volume of this edition. Different in tone to Milton's early verse "On Time"—perhaps suggested by Spenser—the conclusion reached is the same

For, all that moveth, doth in Change delight,
But hence-forth all shall rest eternally
With Him that is the God of Sabbath light
O' That great Sabbath God, grant me that Sabaoth's sight

Just so Milton writes

Then all this earthy grossness quit,
Attired with stars, we shall for ever sit,
Triumphing over Death, and Chance, and thee, O Time

In all variorum editions there must be a certain amount of dead wood, notes that are of no very great interest today. The quest of sources, too, can easily be carried too far into the region of speculation and minute parallels. But this edition is full of matter of the greatest interest for any serious study of Spenser, whose reputation as an ethical and Christian poet seems to be on the rise if Milton's has suffered some abeyance.

H. J. C. GRIERSON

The University, Edinburgh

Proverbs in the Earlier English Drama With Illustrations from Contemporary French Plays By BARTLETT JERE WHITING.
Pp xx + 505. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature,
xiv. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938. \$5.00.

In this, as in his earlier volume, *Chaucer's Use of the Proverb*, Professor Whiting has divided his proverbial material into pro-

verbs, proverbial phrases, and sententious remarks. He presents the results of his study of the proverbs and sententious remarks in eighty-seven plays, or groups of plays, in five chapters on Biblical plays, moralities, interludes, early comedies, and early tragedies. The proverbial phrases he gives without comment in an alphabetical list in Chapter VI. In an "Appendix" of 98 pages he lists the proverbs of a large number of contemporary French plays. This French material, which the author compares at the ends of Chapters I, II, III with his proverbial findings in the English Biblical plays, moralities, and interludes, is "marked more by contrast than likeness." Eight pages of "Notes," a four-page "Index of Names and Works," and an excellent "Verbal Index to English Sayings in Chapters I to V" complete this important study of the proverbial material in the earlier English drama.

In this volume, in which the proverbs of the earlier English drama are collected and studied for the first time, Professor Whiting has opened the way for similar, significant proverbial investigations in other types of our literature. Without the author's intimate acquaintance with early English proverbs this study could not have been made successfully. In the body of the work, he points out in detail that "the use of proverbs has been conventionalized before the English drama developed into its most characteristic forms and that the popularity of homely sayings at the height of the Elizabethan period was no more than a continuation along familiar paths." He points out, also, that the proverbs in the moralities "were obviously not introduced . . . for educational purposes but rather because they were considered humorous and because a wealth of proverbial phrases was felt to increase the effect of low life realism which the Vices were expected to suggest" (p. 66). Other significant, new facts appear in the discussions of the four other, older types of plays. There are occasional discussions of the authorship of groups of related plays in the light of the evidence of their proverbial material.¹ And in a considerable number of instances, the identification of a proverb has enabled the author to substitute for a meaningless or disputed word in a text the right word.²

Professor Whiting's collection of 707 proverbs proper and 1337 proverbial phrases³ from the more than 186,000 lines of the plays examined has added many early instances not before recorded of known proverbs, as well as instances of proverbs and proverbial phrases not before recognized by proverb scholars. Since only in

¹ For discussions as to the authorship of plays, see pp. 22, 105, 292.

² See for instances, pages 8, 73, 78, and elsewhere. A correction of this kind is needed in "But *hyll* bely fyll and make good chere" (p. 184), where "hyll" is a misprint for "fyll."

³ These figures include repetitions of the same proverbs and proverbial phrases, but omit comparisons in the count of the proverbial phrases.

rare instances are the proverbial quotations from the plays identified with their popular forms, before accepting some of the passages cited as proverbial, we shall have to wait for the publication of Whiting's "dictionary of English proverbs recorded before 1550, which will contain copious later examples" We shall want to know, for instance, what evidence there is, other than their proverbial ring, for including among the proverbial phrases, "she hath eaten set leekes" (p. 343, no. 523), or, "I can smell an appell seuen mull in a hays mowe" (p. 364, no. 855)

The task of distinguishing between a proverb and a sententious remark, which is "sometimes very hard," is especially difficult in those instances in the book—not a great number—in which either a sententious remark, because it has become "thoroughly popular in use," is a "proverb," or a proverb, because it has been rephrased in non-popular form, is a "sententious remark." Altered examples of "A friend in need is a friend indeed," which remain "proverbs" (p. 233), and other altered examples of "Might overcomes right," which are sometimes "proverbs" (p. 254), and sometimes "sententious remarks" (p. 200), are instances of the fine lines that are drawn between proverbs that remain or do not remain proverbs depending upon how far they retain or do not retain their original popular form. The author recognizes that he "can scarcely hope that all my readers could agree with all my decisions" This reader would like to know why "be grete fyschys ete be smale" is termed a "sententious remark" (p. 72), when "Fiscis in a pol be gret eteit be smal" is called a "proverb" (p. 67). Both passages, it seems to him, should be classified as proverbs.

In a check of the proverbs from *Ralph Roister Douster*, I find nothing put in "which should have been left out" But I do find that some proverbial material which "should have been put in" has been left out (Preface, p. xi). Four of the nine proverbial items, which I would add to those already noted,⁴ are from Mery-

⁴ The following proverbial quotations that I would add to those collected by Whiting are from the edition of *Ralph Roister Douster* by E. Flugel in C. M. Gayley, *Representative English Comedies, From the Beginning to Shakespeare* (1) *M. Mery* I see you know what is what (I, i, 110, p. 114), (2) *M. Mery* No, but of the same nest (say I) it is a birde (I, ii, 122, p. 114), (3) *Tyb. Talk* No haste but good (I, iii, 11, p. 118) This proverb, found in a quotation cited by Whiting that contains a second proverb (p. 214), seems not to have been included in the count of proverbs in this play, (4) *An. Alyface* Here I founde you, and here I leave both twaine (I, iii, 80, p. 121), (5) *M. Mery* Be of good cheere man, and let the worlde passe (III, iii, 42, p. 144), (6) *Servener* Ye shall have as good as ye bring of me that is plaine (III, v, 30, p. 155); (7) *C. Custance*. Away loute and lubber, or I shall be thy priest (iv, v, 53, p. 176), (8) *M. Mery* The best hennies to grece (iv, vii, 61, p. 171), (9) Thus you see to day a man, to morow John (*none*) (The Psalmodie, l. 4, p. 186) In the above list, only (1), (2), (3), and (9) contain proverbial material not represented in the book by examples from other plays

greek's speeches, and support Whiting's statement that "Mathew Merygreeke is a true Vice in his use of proverbs" (p. 213).

The proverbial phrases in Chapter VI, which are arranged alphabetically "under the modern spelling of the most important word in each phrase," are divided into the two convenient groups of "comparisons" and "other proverbial phrases." The student of Elizabethan literature, and especially of the later Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, will find much light on obscure phrases by consulting the "other proverbial phrases" in this chapter (pp. 333-371). For instance, when the three examples in Whiting's list of "cough me a fool (daw, mome)" (p. 339, no. 474) are examined, it will be seen that Lyly's words in *Mother Bombe* (I, III, 85), "I know hee will cough for anger that I yeeld not, but he shall *cough mee a foole* for his labour," have quite another meaning than that given by Bond in his note on the passage (Lyly's *Works*, III, 538).

It is often difficult to find in the list of "other proverbial phrases" the examples of a particular phrase, either because the phrase in its stereotyped form may differ considerably from the quotation entered in the list or because the quotation may have been alphabetized under one of several nearly equally important words. Bold-face type for the alphabetizing word would have been of assistance in looking for phrases in the list, as would have been the inclusion of the most important words of the phrases in the Verbal Index.

The Verbal Index of twenty-three pages at the end of the volume is a great aid to the full use of the book. By the entry in it of all important words and numerous short phrases in the proverbs and sententious remarks quoted in Chapters I to V, the reader has a quick and accurate key to the two main divisions of proverbial material in this study.

Many of the proverbs and proverbial phrases quoted throughout the book show in their metrical forms such wide divergences from the regular forms of the proverbs, that the reader even with some knowledge of the earlier English proverbs finds it difficult to be sure at times of the proverbial identifications. A Finding-List of Proverbs,⁵ with the same number placed before a proverbial quotation in the text and the corresponding popular proverb in the list, would have furnished a useful key to the quick identification of the proverbial quotations. By reference to such a list, for instance, the reader would not have been left in doubt as to the proverb in "Nay churc nis no wyl cot, Hit wol abid þer" (p. 67), "which has

⁵ The especial value of a Verbal Index of Proverbs, of course, is to enable one to find promptly in the text and notes of a book any one or all of the examples of or references to a particular proverb. A Finding-List of Proverbs, however, does this, and more. It is a *two-way* reference table, of use (1) in identifying proverbial quotations in the text by reference to the table, and (2) in collecting from the text illustrations of proverbs found in the table.

not been understood by all editors" The inclusion of the ninety-eight pages of French proverbs in the Appendix probably made impossible the addition of further useful reference assistance.

The great number of short quotations in this book are faithfully reproduced from facsimile or other old-spelling editions So far as I have been able to check the quotations, I have found them letter perfect The only typographical error that I have noticed is "his respect" for "this respect" on page 240

The author in this book has added substantially to our understanding of the wide and diversified use of proverbs in earlier English drama Other studies of a similar character might profitably be made in the literature of the Elizabethan age, which, in its desire for guidance in its daily living, turned so eagerly and at times so pathetically to the epitomized wisdom of proverbs and sentences. In a "subsequent volume dealing primarily with Shakespeare's use of proverbs" (p 477), Professor Whiting will be continuing his studies in a field in which, by reason of his earlier studies, he is preeminently qualified to explore.

MORRIS P TILLEY

The University of Michigan

L'Origine del Dramma liturgico. By MARIA SOFIA DE VITO. Biblioteca della "Rassegna," XXI. Milano-Genova-Roma-Napoli, Società anonima editrice Dante Alighieri (Albrighi, Segati & C.), 1938. Pp 178. Lire 20.

One's impulse is to welcome with especial warmth a monograph on the origins of medieval drama published from Italy, for from that country we may still expect substantial material additions to our knowledge of the subject This expectation has been agreeably stimulated, of late years, by notable investigations such as those of Professor Vincenzo De Bartholomaeis (*Le Origini della Poesia drammatica italiana*, Bologna, 1924) and Dom Mauro Inguanez (*Un Dramma della Passione del Secolo XII*, Montecassino, 1936). I feel unusual regret, therefore, in reporting that the volume now before me is not an essential contribution to the history of the drama. In all candor I must venture to express my opinion that the monograph of Signorina De Vito presents no fresh information, and offers no sound interpretations which have not been expounded more lucidly elsewhere. It would appear, therefore, that the present review need not be ponderous or lengthy

Although I cannot usurp the space that would be required for exhibiting all the author's contentions, and all the tortuousness of her reasoning, I do engage to present simply and fairly her central thesis. Signorina De Vito's essential undertaking is to demon-

strate that the earliest plays of the medieval Church in Western Europe arose directly from the normal forms of the Roman liturgy, without the mediation of a putative Byzantine drama, or of the well-known dramatic tropes of France. In her dismissal of Byzantine dramatic forms as the originating force in Western European drama, probably most critics will concur, from her rejection of the dramatic tropes of France, the orthodox,—and, I think, the well-informed generally,—will dissent. The earliest of the Church plays under consideration,—in the *Regularis Concordia* of about the year 965,—begins with a dialogue which we call familiarly the *Quem quaeritis*. According to the orthodox view, the dialogue here is not a dramatization of the liturgy itself, which does not contain the required sentences, but is a dramatization of the extra-liturgical trope, *Quem quaeritis*, which contains precisely the required sentences, and which had been inserted in the liturgy at least as early as the first half of the tenth century. The writer of the trope, *Quem quaeritis*, drew, of course, upon the Gospel narrative, and may have been influenced by normal liturgical pieces in the authorized choir-books, but the trope, both in its content and in its wording, is an original, though modest, literary composition. The wording of the dramatized dialogue, *Quem quaeritis*, in the early plays, I repeat, is that of the trope, *Quem quaeritis*, and not that of the Vulgate or the normal liturgy.

What Signorina De Vito undertakes is to dispense with the trope as a source of drama, and to persuade us that the play arose directly from the normal liturgy itself. To this end she stresses the well-known dramatic aspects of traditional liturgical ceremonial, and exhibits well-known fragments of question and answer embedded in the liturgical text. Once more (alas!) we are told that the Mass itself is “il primo e il più grande dramma liturgico” (p. 127), and that some simple textual interrogation transported from the Vulgate into the liturgy is, through some unspecified application of antiphonal singing, in process of becoming drama. The author states the case thus:

Dalle Antifone e dai Responsori della Chiesa di Roma trae origine il teatro sacro, non per l'intromissione di elementi estranei ad essi [i.e. the tropes], nè per un affievolimento dello spirito religioso, ma per una spontanea e logica evoluzione e specificazione di quei frequenti brani dialogici che il canto alterno fra i due gruppi corali doveva sottolineare (p. 134).

The “logica evoluzione” mentioned here is more amply described as follows:

Il *Liber Responsalis* fornisce così lo schema, la formula elementare, il famoso *embrione* primitivo dell' *Officium Sepulchri*. Non vi è nessuna necessità di ricorrere alla scuola di S. Gallo e ai tropi per spiegarne l'origine, dovuta a un processo logico e naturale di evoluzione e di maturazione degli elementi drammatici contenuti nelle antifone e nei responsori.

Ai due semi-cori furono allora sostituiti dei chierici, che sostenevano le

parti delle Marie e dell' Angelo Così i fedeli, che con intensità di fede e d'amore partecipavano ai riti, poterono assistere nel mattino di Pasqua a una commemorazione viva e vera del Mistero di Cristo risorto Due o tre chierici in ampi paludamenti si muovevano verso l'altare, o verso il luogo che simulava il sepolcro Là doveva essersi precedentemente recato un altro chierico in bianca veste, l'Angelo Al sepolcro avveniva l'incontro

Così al dialogo già esistente nei responsori e nelle antifone fu congiunto l'altro elemento costitutivo del dramma l'azione E nacque il primo dramma pasquale (pp 141-142)

In these representative paragraphs,—I say it with reluctance,—the author seems to me to abandon established historical fact, and to engage in nebulous fancy.

KARL YOUNG

Yale University

Voltaire, Le Temple du Goût, éd crit par E CARCASSONE Paris ·

E Droz, 1938 Pp 197 Soc. des textes fr. mod.

L'Humanisme de Diderot Par JEAN THOMAS Paris Les Belles

Lettres, s. d. Pp. 185 Études fr.

Deux livres petits, mais excellents, et qui ne sont pas sans rapport quant à leur contenu et quant à l'esprit des deux savants qui les ont préparés

Carcassonne, fin critique, gourmet littéraire, se révèle commentateur parfait. Il sait apprécier les remarquables jugements de Voltaire à un âge où celui-ci se laissait encore guider par le goût seul et non pas par des rancunes personnelles ou par la jalousie; c'était en 1733 Le seul qui "écope" vraiment, c'est en somme le poète J-B. Rousseau On a marché depuis les jours de Boileau. Le Temple est celui de

Ce Dieu charmant que l'on ignore
Quand on cherche à le définir,
Ce Dieu qu'on ne sait point servir
Quand avec scrupule on l'adore

Beaucoup y sont reçus avec réserve, auxquels Boileau avait ouvert largement la porte, et beaucoup de ceux-ci en sont exclus C'est que Voltaire ramène le goût à une affaire de sentiment et récuse un dogme soi-disant rationnel. Il y a des perles comme "Le sage Boileau, ce Maître du Parnasse, ayant rendu justice à tant d'auteurs se la rendait aussi . . ." Ou bien, Ninon, ayant dans ce Temple une place d'honneur ·

Ninon cet objet si vanté
Qui si longtemps scut faire usage
De son esprit et de sa beauté,
Et du talent d'être volage,
Faisait alors, avec gaieté,
A ce charmant Aréopage,
Un discours sur la Volupté .

Voltaire entrevoit déjà la synthèse des arts que la fin du XIX^e siècle essaiera tant de fois de réaliser, car dans son Temple

On y passe, facilement
De la Musique à la Peinture,
De la Physique au sentiment,
Du Tragique au simple Agrément,
De la Danse à l'Architecture

M. Carcassonne donne les deux versions, de Rouen 1733, et de Kehl 1784. L'appareil d'érudition est parfait tout ce qu'on attend aujourd'hui d'un savant qui établit un texte critique, variantes de style, et—fort important ici—variantes des notes de l'auteur, index, etc.

Le Diderot de M. Thomas n'est pas moins digne de louanges, appartenant à une autre collection qui, depuis que Paul Hazard en est l'éditeur s'impose de plus en plus à l'attention des travailleurs. Admirons comment, en quinze pages, 169-184, M. Thomas a su faire tenir tout l'essentiel d'une bibliographie intelligemment conçue. Le corps du livre est extrêmement alerte et répond bien à son titre *L'Humanisme de Diderot*. Il était difficile de rendre justice aux aspects si divers de celui-ci sans tomber dans l'imprécision. "de toutes parts, il (Diderot) voit luire des parcelles de vérités n'est-il pas douloureux de renoncer à l'une d'entre elles? Au prix d'un tel sacrifice, la cohérence des idées lui semble une faible consolation" (47). En somme, Diderot est présenté comme un négatif "s'il avait rejeté le dogme si séduisant du Christianisme, ce n'était pas pour se soumettre à d'autres dogmatismes, aussi gratuits que celui-là, et moins vénérables". Et, en quelque sorte, il se réfugie chez Leibnitz "Encore sur le sens de cette adhésion, convient-il de faire quelques réserves" (98).

Est-il bien vrai que, comme le veut l'auteur (pp. 32, 34), Brunetière et Faguet aient réussi à faire tant déconsidérer Diderot?

Répétons en terminant qu'une même impression demeure de ces deux études, et qui doit nous mettre en garde contre les clichés en littérature chez Voltaire et chez Diderot, et sans d'ailleurs que ni Carcassonne ni Thomas en fassent une thèse, on voit les deux grands rationalistes du XVIII^e siècle, après que tout a été dit, finissant par donner le pas au sentiment. On nous rappelle le mot de Diderot "Si Nature a pétri une âme sensible, c'est la mienne" (57), et. "La sensibilité est la caractéristique de la bonté de l'âme" (58);¹ quant à Voltaire, il suffit de rappeler qu'il a appelé sa fantaisie. Temple "du Goût" et non Temple "de la Raison," comme l'eût fait Boileau.

ALBERT SCHINZ

Université de Pensylvanie

¹ On n'en est pas moins d'accord avec Thomas, que Trahard a un peu faussé la notion de "sensibilité" chez Diderot dans son grand ouvrage *Les Maîtres de la sensibilité française* (1933).

Lost Angel and Other Poems. By PEDRO SALINAS. Translations by ELEANOR L TURNBULL. Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938 Pp xv + 169.

If the gifted translator of these poems by one of the most distinguished poets of present day Spain has not included among them a few selections from *La voz a ti debida* (1933), a great poem of love, and from *Razón de amor* (1936), the most profoundly lyric of Salinas's books, it is undoubtedly because of lack of space due to an obvious desire to include instead a hitherto unpublished gem, *Angel extraviado*, written in 1937. The other poems in this collection are taken from three volumes published in Madrid which "represent a complete cycle in the author's poetic career" *Piesagios* (1923), *Seguro azar* (1929); *Fábula y signo* (1931)

Miss Turnbull's translations are as literal as it is possible without disturbing the rhythmic quality of the Spanish meter and without blurring the bizarre contour and delicacy of the original images. At times, however, a certain inexpressible vagueness and exquisite unsubstantiality of the original seem to take corporeal, if transparent and lucid, form in the English verse. One enjoys reading both versions, which are conveniently placed side by side, and, in doubtful passages, one is pleased to follow Miss Turnbull's poetic detours in order to resume the meandering flow of sensations, tones, hues, and reverberations of the Spanish original. But at no time does Miss Turnbull fail to understand the poet, and never does she project unduly her own artistic personality. Hers has been a very delicate task. The amazing faithfulness of her verse for verse translations can be judged from the following example taken at random

¡Soledad, soledad, tú me acompañas
y de tu propia pena me libertas!
Solo, quiero estar solo
que si suena una voz aquí a mi lado
o si una boca en la boca me besa,
te escapas tú vergonzosa y ligera

Solitude, solitude, you attend me
and from your pain you free me!
Alone, I desire to be alone
if a voice speaks here at my side,
or if lips on my lips lay a kiss,
you escape you bashful and swift
one

Not the least interesting part of this volume is its preface. In it Pedro Salinas gives us a glimpse into a corner of his *ars poetica* as he elaborates on the questions: Is there a public for these poems? Who will the public be? What will it be like? Poetry, he tells us, cannot be popularized because it does not distract us nor attract us, but it retracts, withdraws us into ourselves. And what most persons wish today is to go out of themselves, not to enter into themselves. According to the poet, the great infirmity of the modern being is this incompatibility with his own deepest and most mysterious self from whom he constantly wishes to escape. This limits the possible public, for poetry demands an inner activity, intense collaboration with the poet, and not simple reading.

This volume is, indeed, a proof of such an assertion. Simple reading will not do to understand Salinas's nuances. One must collaborate with him, and Miss Turnbull has made such a collaboration possible for the American readers of poetry—"those hands," as Salinas says, "which still in addition to their function of work and usefulness, know how to hold before their eyes, under a lamp, alone, or in a street-car or a train, among many others, a book of verses."

CARLOS CASTILLO

The University of Chicago

Heinrich von Kleists Werke Zweite Auflage. Neu durchgesehen und erweitert von GEORG MINDE-POUET. Vols. III-VII. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut. (1938).

Of the three editors of the first edition of *Heinrich von Kleists Werke*, published by the Bibliographisches Institut almost a quarter of a century ago, Erich Schmidt and Reinhold Steig have died. The new edition has been prepared by the sole survivor, Georg Minde-Pouet.

The five volumes under review were preceded by two others which present Kleist's letters.¹ Volumes III to V contain his dramas, volume VI contains his narratives, and volume VII the poems and minor writings. One more volume with notes and variants is still to appear.

Although they are based on the first edition, the critical introductions have been most carefully revised with due regard for the vast amount of research on Kleist which has appeared since 1904. They are veritable models of clarity, compactness and precision. Changes in the introductions consist primarily in the omission of outmoded statements, the addition of dates, the listing of proper names in full, more logical arrangement, and the presentation of much supplementary material. Because of the difference in type in the two editions, the number of additional pages cannot be estimated satisfactorily. The scope of the introductions has been widened by an extended account of literary influences, the reception accorded Kleist's dramas, characterization of adaptations for the stage, the history of their production, and by references to illustrations, paintings and musical compositions based on the author's works. It is of interest to note that *Das Kathchen von Heilbronn* has given rise to six operas, that Austrian censorship prohibited the production of *Die Hermannsschlacht* until the World War and that the popularity of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, the drama of

¹ Reviewed in *MLN*, LIX, 362 f. (1937).

Kleist which is played most frequently, has grown steadily since the seventies of the nineteenth century. Information has been added about translations of Kleist's works and about dramatizations of some of his narratives for the stage and the cinema. Illustrations and facsimiles heighten the attractiveness of the new edition. Textual changes in the major works are largely in orthography and punctuation.

Marked changes are to be found in the sequence and contents of volume VII. The poems are arranged chronologically in the order of their origin, or of publication in case the date of origin is unknown. The sole exceptions to this sequence are a few occasional poems, which were published as a group by Kleist in the journal *Phobus*, and the epigrams. The latter are now grouped in four series. New additions are "Hymne an die Sonne," two more versions of the ode "Germania an ihre Kinder," and six autographs. From volume V of the first edition have been transferred four autographs, one of which now bears a suggested new date, and "Todeslitanei," which formerly appeared as a letter to Adolfine Henriette Vogel (V, 403). This letter is now divided into lines of irregular verse. The three poems dedicated to Queen Louise of Prussia appear in the same sequence as previously, but they now bear the headings of first, second and third version, respectively.

Even greater changes mark Kleist's minor writings. The introduction by the late Reinhold Steig has been replaced by an entirely new one from the pen of Helmut Sembdner, whose more detailed investigations on the *Berliner Abendblätter* are to appear shortly as volume XIX of the *Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft*. Sembdner has regrouped Kleist's minor writings under the following headings: Philosophische und ästhetische Schriften, Anekdoten und Kurzgeschichten, Politische Schriften des Jahres 1809, Berichterstattung und Tageskritik 1810 und 1811, Übersetzungen aus dem Französischen, Bearbeitungen fremder Vorlagen, and Redaktionelle Anzeigen und Erklärungen. There are textual changes, omissions and additions. The former are relatively few in number, six items have been omitted as not coming from Kleist's pen, and a large body of writings, fifty-five in number, has been added. A lucid introduction characterizes Kleist as a journalist, and explains the basis for changes as well as their significance.

Limitations of space forbid a more detailed review. Adverse comments to be made are but few; they concern minor externalities of make-up, determined by the publisher. The pagination is inconvenient, since each introduction, drama and "Novelle" has its separate numbering of pages. With no consecutive pagination throughout each volume, reference becomes difficult. The lines of the "Novellen" and poems are not numbered. The lines of the dramas are not numbered in the margin, but their range is indicated at the bottom of each page, e. g., 738-765. The critical intro-

ductions list translations of the first three dramas only. Although the elimination of footnotes makes for a more attractive type-page, it becomes necessary to consult another volume for explanations. On the other hand, the introductions are printed in larger, better type than in the first edition. A further gain lies in placing the introductions before the list of characters rather than between the *dramatis personae* and the drama proper as is the case in the first edition. The proofreading has been done with meticulous care.

As a result of numerous important additions, corrections and other changes, the old edition has become distinctly outmoded. The new, greatly improved edition is the fruit of decades of patient, devoted, exacting research by the distinguished authority Georg Minde-Pouet.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

Wesleyan University

Heinrich von Kleist und J. J. Rousseau VON OSKAR RITTER VON XYLANDER *Germanische Studien*, Heft 193 Berlin Eberling, 1937 Pp 389

The aim of von Xylander's study is to investigate the spiritual kinship of Rousseau and Heinrich von Kleist, and to determine the extent of Rousseau's influence upon the latter's emotions, thoughts and works. An analysis of the attitude of Kleist's generation toward Rousseau is followed by a survey of critical literature on Kleist which bears on the relations of the two men. After this lengthy preliminary study the author examines Kleist's letters and works for traces of Rousseau. A summary of findings is followed by an extended bibliography.

Although the author is well versed in Rousseau and in critical literature on Kleist, the portion of the bibliography devoted to the latter is limited to works written in German. Quotations from Rousseau are given in German translation. The alphabetical arrangement of the bibliography has not been carried out with complete consistency (p. 387). The book contains no index.

It is surprising to note the fact that in earlier opinions and writings on Kleist by Goethe, Tieck, Eichendorff, Grillparzer, Heine, Hebbel, Ludwig, Bulow, Gervinus, Julian Schmidt, Treitschke and Wilbrandt no allusion was made to Rousseau, and that as late as 1884 Otto Brahm was the first critic to concern himself more carefully with Kleist's attitude toward Rousseau. Prior to Brahm's biography there had been but casual references to the subject by Erich Schmidt, Scherer and Zolling.

Von Xylander has studied his sources carefully, has written with clarity and restraint, and has been on his guard against far-fetched interpretations of Kleist's works. He has exercised discriminating

judgment in the difficult question of literary influence, in pointing out differences as well as similarities between Rousseau and Kleist, and in differentiating between mere kinship of spirit and actual influence. He is at his best in the analysis of Kleist's letters and in tracing the evolution of Kleist's views on life against a background of the thought of his time. In the examination of Kleist's works for traces of influence he is obviously on more debatable ground.

The author gives a convincing presentation of the decisive influence of Rousseau upon Kleist's change from a rationalistic view of life to one in which intuitive judgments and reliance on feeling are stressed. He regards Rousseau as having saved Kleist from complete collapse after his disillusionment through Kantian philosophy. Although the detailed examination of some of Kleist's works yields relatively little of importance for the subject under discussion, the treatise as a whole is a commendable contribution.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

Wesleyan University

Grillparzer's dramatisches Werk Fünfzehn Vorlesungen gehalten an der Universität Wien. By EMIL REICH Wien, 1938 Saturn Verlag Pp 366.

The university lectures on *Grillparzer's Drama* which Reich published in 1894 are the basis for this book, but his earlier interpretation has been subjected to a thorough revision in the light of later investigations and the *Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe*. The purpose of this new book is not a philological presentation of Grillparzer's life and works. The expressed desire of the author is rather to reach a wider audience, especially those interested in Grillparzer as a playwright whose works are still a vital part of the modern stage.

Therefore, the author reduces the biographical material to what he considers a minimum for the understanding of the individual dramas. He also omits a coherent presentation of the historical and spiritual background, although he devotes much space to scattered remarks on these questions. The purpose of this book, of course, perfectly justifies the author in omitting all detailed interpretation of the dramas before the *Ahnfrau*.

Each chapter begins with a brief, yet detailed survey of the origin of the drama, including a discussion of the use of themes which appear in fragments and the dramas preceding the *Ahnfrau*. Also related motives in the works of other dramatists which were known to Grillparzer are referred to in more or less detailed comparison. The main emphasis of this study, however, is placed on the minute

examination of psychological motivation, and in this examination a number of often overlooked subtleties are revealed

The author well recognizes that the historical form of Grillparzer's dramas is no more than an esthetic symbol for the presentation of problems which concern the poet himself and his time. He justly stresses this point, *e g.*, in a comparison between *Medea* and Ibsen's *Pillars of Society*, but this fact deserves an even greater emphasis and a more consistent application to all historical plays

At many points, it seems to me that the author is still too much influenced by the theory of tragic guilt and atonement, thus, *e g.*, when he maintains that Sappho's death atones for the deviation from her calling as a poetess. In her case, the tragedy lies much deeper, namely, in the fact that her ideal striving severed her from the soil from which her poetry should have drawn its nurturing force, and that this severance is an irrevocable fate. Because he fails to emphasize the factor of rootedness in Grillparzer's plays, Reich is unable to integrate the dramas as the expression of one personality, which, in spite of many detours, developed consistently

It cannot be denied that Kant and his rigorous conception of moral duty greatly influenced Grillparzer's dramatic work, but for me there is no question that Grillparzer differs more fundamentally from Kant's critical idealism than the author appears to admit. Duty is for Grillparzer much less of a heroic autonomy of Reason than it was for Kant or Schiller. Even in the best example of a moral decision, that of King Alfonso in *Die Juden von Toledo*, there remains the impression of some heteronomous determination by fate and tradition. Reich recognizes the determinative factor in Banchanus' bureaucratic heroism, but he fails to see in this factor the fundamental deviation from classical idealism, and he fails to integrate this deviation with the realism in the psychological motivation of the characters

In spite of these criticisms, there remains the one outstanding value of this book: the thorough and detailed analysis of psychological motivation

F. W. KAUFMANN

Oberlin College

Lichtenberg's Visits to England, as described in his Letters and Diaries. Translated and annotated by MARGARET L. MARE and W. H. QUARRELL, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, New York: Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. xxiv + 132. \$2.75.

Georg Christoph Lichtenberg, as a scientist, a philosopher, and an articulate observer of men and manners, was a figure of no mean consequence in the Hanoverian State during the last quarter of the eighteenth century. But he is of especial interest to the English

because of his interpretation to his German contemporaries of every branch of English art. From his many writings Miss Mare and Mr Quarrell have selected and translated sufficient of his letters from England to form a slender but valuable volume.

The introduction sets forth briefly his life, character, and significance in German literary history. The selections from his Diaries together with the twenty-six Letters which compose the volume speak eloquently and shrewdly the mind of this enthusiastic Anglophile. He was intimate with George III and his family, and his picture of the king as a domestic man and a kindhearted patron is refreshing. His dislike of English weather is as commonplace as his praise of English cooking is eccentric. His pleasure in meeting English men is equalled only by his joy in beholding the beauty of English women. He journeyed all the way to Birmingham to discuss printing with Baskerville. He made a special visit to the grave of Sterne. He went to Stratford to see Shakespeare's birthplace, and bought a piece of wood cut from Shakespeare's chair to have made up into rings for his friends at Gottingen. He listened with eagerness to parliamentary debates on the treatment of the American colonies.

Interesting as his comments on such a range of subjects may be, the real value of his letters lies in their passages of dramatic criticism. Three long epistles, which make up one-third of the contents of the volume, were written to H. C. Boie to be published in the *Deutsches Museum*. In these as well as in other letters he discusses over two dozen English plays and as many actors. He was a born dramatic critic. He was writing to a German public that had never seen the plays, hence with accuracy of observation and extremely successful articulation he described plots, scenes, parts, and costumes, but above all analysed the acting.

Garrick was his idol. "In order to see Garrick play," he writes, "I once set out at half past nine in the morning on a journey of six German miles, missed my dinner, and did not eat until after eleven o'clock in the evening." His observations on the actor leave no significant point untouched. He speaks with enthusiasm about Garrick's knowledge of his parts, his unceasing study of men and manners in order to interpret them, his judicious make-up and costuming, his penetrating glance, his grace, his muscular control, his mobile face, his admiration of Shakespeare, and close adherence to the dramatist's texts. Minute analysis is given of his action as Hamlet and as Sir John Brute. "He moves to and fro among other players," writes Lichtenberg, "like a man among marionettes." Although Garrick draws him like a lodestone he finds time and space to remark with critical acumen upon Macklin, Quin, Weston, "Gentleman Smith," Reddish, Mrs. Yates, Mrs. Abington, Madame Gabrielli, and a score of others.

His careful and vivid picturing of the scenes he witnesses fairly

takes the sting from Cibber's statement concerning the ephemeral quality of the art of acting "O what a pity it is that the strong and beautiful strokes of a great actor should not be as lasting as the strokes of the pencil or chisel of inferior artists" Posterity gains as much from Lichtenberg's letters as did his Hanoverian friends They are well worth perusal, especially as the translators have supplied them with adequate but unobtrusive notes

GEORGE W. STONE, JR

The George Washington University

Peter Idley's Instructions to his Son. Edited with Introduction and Notes by CHARLOTTE D'EVELYN Boston D C Heath, London H Milford. 1935. vii + 240 pp. \$2 50

Miss D'Evelyn's edition will be welcome. Historians and sociologists, as well as students of ME, have been anxious for more documents that would reveal the habits and modes of life, and particularly the education, of the squirearchy of the 15th century. Here is one such, and a revealing one at that

Idley's solicitude for his son's spiritual and material welfare was greater than his literary skill, though it is only fair to say that he never pretended to "Retorik ne floressed eloquence." It drove him on to lengths that would bore the most attentive reader or most obedient son His precepts are of the nature of a general counsel of perfection, so much so that one bit of advice jars against another Thus, at one and the same time the younger Idley is urged to live at peace with his wife, and yet not allow her to have the mastery! One can understand why such excellent paternal counsel was wasted on the recipient. He probably found out by bitter experience, as we all do, that a particular rule or principle of all those urged might be the worst possible for a certain particular occasion, and that it was not always easy to distinguish at first sight the false friend or principle from the true. One cannot but believe that Idley *père* so prided himself upon his plunge into "belles lettres," that he often unconsciously allowed the advice of his source to crowd out of his mind the lessons of his own native wit and past experience

I sey no thyng but as myn auctor techeth
Euer the yonge cok croweth as the olde precheth

Yet the reviewer feels rewarded for many dull hours. One closes the book with the feeling that he has made the acquaintance of an interesting person, a countryman of the upper middle classes who is distinctly "on the make" Idley did not let grass grow under

his feet, and fed so often and successfully at "the public trough" that he obtained, before retiring, the Controllershship of the Public Works

His sources, though heavily used, are not many, two treatises of Albertanus of Brescia, Mannyng's *Handlyng Synne*, and Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*. We are indebted to Miss D'Evelyn for carefully pointing out just when Idley ceased to echo his source and spoke out for himself. It is then that he most commends himself to us. His sermons, Albertanus Englished, may fade from memory, but his vignettes of country life remain. The editor calls attention to an Oxfordshire landscape (II A, 1455). There are many other such pictures: the ejection of the tramp at the farmyard (or postern) gate, the changeable weather-vane on manor-house or barn, the overloaded wain, the ruined abbey sunk into a grange, the chained mastiff, the sleepy dormouse, the lark's conspicuous little topknot.

There are seven mss. of the *Instructions*, some of them imperfect. It was the editor's problem to produce a sensible and, as far as she could do so, an accurate text. She has chosen as her basic ms. one at Cambridge University (Ee. 4.37). I imagine that few will quarrel with her choice. Mr G. D. Willcock, in an able review of the present volume, which he kindly sent me upon request, quite correctly criticizes the editor for elimination of original metrical pointing within the line, and destruction of 15th century sentence-structure by imposition of modern punctuation. Prosodists and rhetoricians are the losers by such a convention, but editors have also to think of "readers" and "quoters." Your reviewer would hate to have to use frequently an unmodernized text of *Pearl* or *Troilus*.

A few lexicographical notes follow. *Geste* (I, 305) could be "jest." *Good* (I, 631) is certainly "God," as quot. in notes implies. For *boncheif* (I, 686) see C. F. Brown's *Register of ME Religious Verse* I, 506-7, fol. 93. *Froke* (I, 945), 'outer covering,' is found in *Purity*, 136, 1742, it does not seem forced when used to refer to a bird's feather covering. *Petaunce* (II, 1178) is an early example of the meaning "a scanty meal." *Folde* (II, 2456), "give way, fail"; see *NED* (s. v. *fold*, v¹ 5). *Enpanelled* (II, 2732) is given by *NED* as first occurring in 1487 (in French in 1383). *Blake* (II B, 1308), "yellow, fallow," as in *Pearl* 27 and *Gaw.* 958. *Saute* (II B, 2114), "a jump" or "fall?" *Feendy coope* (II B, 2251), cf. the modern expression "cope of heaven" (*NED* s. v. *cope*, sb¹ 7), but it may be the article of attire—as it is used by the devils.

The edition is concise, well-balanced, sane, and exact—a credit to the editor and the Monograph Series of the *MLA*.

HENRY L. SAVAGE

Princeton University

The Making of "The Cloister and the Hearth." By ALBERT MORTON TURNER. Chicago University of Chicago Press, 1938
Pp x + 230. \$3 00

Although Reade's own list of sources, printed in *The Century Magazine*, has been known, no systematic account of his use of his materials was attempted until Professor Turner commenced the present study. He has read every book mentioned as a source in the *Century* list or in the notebooks, and by parallel passages, verbal similarities, and identities of detail he has shown precisely what Reade took from these books for his novel. Of the seventy-four books on the *Century* list, Reade is shown to have been indebted most to thirty-five, including Erasmus' *Colloquies*, travellers' tales such as those by Moryson, Coryate, and Montaigne, and the histories of Michel and Fournier and of Lacroix and Seré. Though he has limited his investigations to works mentioned by Reade and admittedly has not discovered the sources of all the materials used by his author, Professor Turner, doing what he proposed to do, has provided the completest guide to Reade's materials. Future investigators will have to be content to glean.

As the historical novelist must, Reade had a passion for fact. He depended, as Professor Turner shows, upon authorities not only for details of costume, towns, inns, and manners, but for many of the adventures in which his characters were involved, such as Gerard's experiences in the windmill and with the bears. Even the soup consumed by Gerard is authentic, and the German cheese to which he is exposed carries the authority of Fynes Moryson. As Professor Turner candidly admits, however, the source of the cheese was among Mr. Wheeler's discoveries.

Reade was not as uninventive as this care for historical detail might imply. He often combined details from several sources, in the interests of drama he suppressed, elaborated, and rearranged. From casual hints his fancy created some of the most affective scenes and characters of the book. Professor Turner's parallel passages also are designed to show that Reade not infrequently improved scenes taken from Erasmus or Montaigne. In short, Reade is presented as an artist, and one is compelled, with only the smallest reservations, to agree as Professor Turner repeatedly exclaims: "Reade, once more, has developed this brief and commonplace account into a masterpiece of thrilling narrative."

It is plain that Professor Turner is not only an investigator of sources but the student, as his title implies, of an artist's mind, of the creation of a novel from hint and fact. He has followed a broader road to a lesser Xanadu. His work should be of interest to those concerned with the process of creation as well as to historians of the novel and to those who like Reade. It would be unjust to this audience to say with a correspondent on Reade in *Notes and Queries*,

quoted by Professor Turner, that " 'Nobody but an antiquary really wants chapter and verse for every detail in an historical novel' " But perhaps, as Professor Turner remarks, it is just as well that this correspondent never saw the present book Here, as in his treatment of sources and of art, Professor Turner leaves little to be said.

WILLIAM Y TINDALL

Columbia University

BRIEF MENTION

Shakespeare. By THOMAS MARC PARROTT, EDWARD HUBLER, and ROBERT STOCKDALE TELFER. New York Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937 Pp x + 1116 \$4 00 This is one of the most attractive textbooks now obtainable for use in colleges and universities. The format is unusually fine. Explanatory notes and glosses are placed at the bottom of each page in order to save the student's time This is not a concession to student laziness but to the ever increasing pressure of work. Instructive and readable introductions precede each of the twenty-three plays and the sonnets published in this volume. An exceedingly serviceable handbook, the Introduction furnishes the student with much needed information in regard to such matters as Shakespeare's life, his development, his theatre, his audience. The introductions to the individual plays and the handbook are of such a nature as to make Shakespeare interesting to modern students There are, of course, in any edition of Shakespeare's plays details which some of the leading authorities will not fancy. There is, for example, the quarto reading, "O that this too too sullied flesh would melt," with no mention whatever in the notes that most editors prefer the folio reading "solid flesh" to which we are all accustomed Why should Hamlet pray for flesh already decomposing to decompose? On page 4 of the introduction is found a statement which may turn many fine young "liberals" (whatever that may mean) away from Shakespeare.

there is nothing plainer in Shakespeare's work than his inborn sympathy with refinement, courtesy, and aristocratic charm He detested the London mob as heartily as any nobleman, and nothing in his life probably gave him greater pleasure than his success in lifting himself out of the despised players' caste and writing himself down "William Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon, gentleman"

There are many savage criticisms to be found in the mouths of Shakespeare's characters of conventional aristocracy Shakespeare

portrays human nature irrespective of class prejudice. Hence his finest quality, "universality." No one knows what Shakespeare the man believed about such matters. The editors are to be congratulated on a book which will enable Shakespeare to hold his own against all new comers, called literary masters, in our colleges and universities.

GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR

The University of North Carolina

Excursions in English Drama. By ROBERT WITHINGTON. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937. Pp. x + 264. \$1.50. This small-sized book is full of the interesting observations of a specialist in the fields of the drama he discusses. Withington's style is vigorous and stimulating throughout, even in the section on Early Pronunciation. The opening essay on the Corpus Christi Play as drama is significant from a scholar who, like Coffman, contends that the mystery plays are excellent as plays. As to their being great as literature, that is not insisted upon; Shakespeare himself doubtless was not speaking of his plays when he wrote the lines

Not marble nor the gilded monuments
Of princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme

"Miracles Old and New" shows close kinship between the old morality plays and types of present-day plays; Green Pastures is cited appropriately in this connection. In the section on "The Vice, its Ancestry and Development," Withington is at his best. He was the first to reach the important conclusion that the parasite as a stock character on its evil side culminates in Iago, on its comic side in Falstaff. In "Morality and Melodrama," once more old material is vitalized for modern readers, but Withington is on dangerous ground when he refers to *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Richard II, and Constance, as satires on sentimentality, however gentle that satire may be. "On Early Pronunciation" gives us excellent precedent even in Shakespeare and Pope for our own tendency in moods of intense passion, especially in anger, to lapse into New England and Southern pronunciations.

GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR

The University of North Carolina

Shakespeare's Influence on the Drama of his Age Studied in Hamlet. By DONALD JOSEPH MCGINN. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1938. Pp. ix + 241. \$3.00. Dr. McGinn's revised Cornell doctoral dissertation is issued as the first of the projected Rutgers University Studies in English. In a series of

short chapters he surveys the relation of *Hamlet* to various Elizabethan revenge-plays and to Beaumont and Fletcher, imitations of characters and of individual scenes from *Hamlet*, burlesques of the play, and direct allusions. As a final section, 474 verbal allusions are recorded between 1600 and 1642. No collection of so-called parallel passages can entirely please every critic, with such shadowy material there is bound to be doubt whether in all instances direct influence is indeed to be conjectured. In such matters, however, it is perhaps better to err on the side of grace, and Dr. McGinn's large collection, so completely displacing *The Shakspeare Allusion Book's* meager forty-five parallels, will be of permanent value, subject to individual winnowing. The chapters on burlesques and outright allusions are excellent compendiums of precise information. Less can be said for the critical part of the work. Here the subjects are too complex to be treated so briefly except in a very sketchy and superficial manner. Little attempt is made in these sections to disentangle the specific influence of Shakespeare on later playwrights from that of other dramatists like Kyd, and especially Tourneur, who had treated the same material. One may also hesitate over a number of the references. Every character in Elizabethan drama who becomes melancholy following a shock (as Captain Ager in *A Fair Quarrel*) or is disappointed in the virtue of a woman (as Amintor and Melantius in *The Maid's Tragedy*) does not necessarily hark back to Hamlet. The long section on verbal allusions, even though it does not include unpublished manuscript material, is quite as thorough as is necessary, except for the two mentioned, the preliminary chapters cannot be considered as definitive.

FREDSON T. BOWERS

The University of Virginia

The Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences: Studies in Conventional Conceits. By LISLE CECIL JOHN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. x + 278. \$2.75. Miss John disclaims any "pretense to originality in recalling the course of the Petrarchan sonnet in England, the Italian origin of the sonnet form, and the growth and establishment of the form in France," but many readers will find this part of her work not only more concise and accurate than the account given by Sir Sidney Lee in 1903 but also more interesting than her somewhat stiff and cataloguing discussion of conventional conceits in the sonnets. Her elaborate notes, appendixes, and bibliographies also present much material of interest and value. The notes, however, are difficult to use. The book has no chapter numbers, chapter titles like "Anatomy of Melancholy" are given

only on fly-leaves, and subchapter titles appear on both recto and verso as running-titles. Hence a reader of a chapter apparently entitled "Conventional Comparisons" must go to a good deal of trouble to locate notes 59 to 82 in the back of the book under "Anatomy of Melancholy." Incidentally, the Todd manuscript of Constable, which is said (p. 214) to be no longer in existence, is now MS. Dyce 44 in the South Kensington Museum.

HYDER E. ROLLINS

Harvard University

A Petite Pallace Of Pettie His Pleasure Edited by HERBERT HARTMAN. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. xxxiv + 327. \$6.50. This edition of the *Pallace* by Mr. Hartman should do much to rectify the impression existing in many minds that Lyly was "the onlie begetter" of euphuism, the ornate style so natural to an age of great poetry. The editor's objective appears to have been three-fold: to produce an accurate text by collating the six extant editions, to supply an introduction, giving Pettie his due recognition, and to provide notes suggesting "some probable—and a few unmistakable—sources of the two hundred aphorisms, sententiae, and their like." Mr. Hartman has apparently presented his text with admirable precision. The introduction is adequate except that an exacting critic might object to the repeated omission of page references (e. g., pp. ix, xxvi, xxvii), to occasional inaccuracies in expression (e. g., the *Pallace* was published in 1576, *Euphuies* in 1578; the editor states on p. x that Pettie's book antedates Lyly's "by several years"), and to incorrect quotations from his own text (see pp. xxiv, 38, and 100, and pp. xxxiv and 137). Finally, among the principal studies of euphuism listed, P. W. Long's "From *Troilus* to *Euphuies*" in the *Kittredge Anniversary Papers* should have been included. William Ringler's important discussion of John Rainold's contribution to euphuism (*PMLA*, LIII [Sept., 1938], 678 ff.) was, of course, too late to be noticed. The notes on the aphorisms and the sententiae, Pettie's chief stylistic ornaments, are copious, although a few sources have been missed. The editor could have found the simile of the spider's sensitivity to the pricking of its web (p. 138) anticipated in Lord Berners's translation of Guevara's *Golden Boke*. But these objections are insignificant and do not in the least detract from a greatly needed edition, competently done.

G. J. VINCENT

Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIV

MAY, 1939

Number 5

BYRON'S TRANSLATION AND USE OF MODERN GREEK WRITINGS

Byron's translations of three modern Greek songs, among the minor products of his first visit to Greece in 1809 to 1811, present the following problems: how much modern Greek Byron came to know, what means he had at his disposal for understanding the texts translated, in what respect the changes he brought to the originals exemplify his orientalism.¹

Byron set out on his tour to the East in the spring of 1809, accompanied by his friend Hobhouse. In September the travelers reached Patras, thence they went to Epirus and Albania; retracing their steps, they came back to Patras, then turning east, they visited Delphi, and passing through Beotia and Attica, made their way to Athens. After ten weeks in and around Athens, they left in March 1810 for Smyrna, Troy, and other sites, reaching finally Constantinople, where they spent three months. In July Hobhouse sailed for Malta and England, and Byron returned to Athens. From July 1810 to April or May 1811 he remained there, except for a tour in Peloponesus. In European Turkey Byron came in contact mainly with the Greek language. According to contemporary travelers, Greek was preponderant in this part of the Empire, not only among the Greeks, but also among the Turks and the Albanians. W. M. Leake notes that Turkish "is little understood, even by the Musulmans themselves, and it is confined to the large cities and some districts of Macedonia."² Hobhouse also asserts that among the Albanians "very few of them . . . cannot speak

¹ F. Maychrzak, in "Lord Byron als Übersetzer," *Englische Studien*, XXI, 384 f., gives these translations only a short mention.

² *Researches in Greece*, 1814, p. v.

Greek, and, as their own is not a written language, a great many of them write and read that tongue. . . . The Turkish language is known but to very few, even of the Mahometans amongst them."³ Our travelers had a Greek interpreter, a number of armed guards, and often a small party of persons who happened to take the same course. Byron's own letters show him anything but reserved with the members of his suite and generally with the people of the country. The remarks he makes about modern Greek (which he usually calls *romanic*), and his statement that he planned to study it in Athens show his interest in the language soon after he arrived in the country.⁴ But during his first visit to Athens he gives no indication of having studied it with a tutor. The travelers were in constant contact with the English and the French as well as with the Greeks of the town, and two months after he had left Attica for Asia Minor and Constantinople, Byron wrote "I have lived a good deal with the Greeks whose modern dialect I can converse in enough for my purposes"⁵ And again "I speak the Romaic, or modern Greek tolerably. It does not differ from the ancient dialects so much as you would conceive, but the pronunciation is diametrically opposite."⁶ All this time, as well as when he returned to Athens, he had an interpreter with him.⁷ During his second stay in Athens, at the Capuchin convent, he entered into playful terms with six young boys, the pupils of the Franciscan friar, six *sylphs*, as he calls them, in whose games and riots he did not disdain to participate. He speaks of them as of his constant companions, beside Fauvel, the French consul, and Lusieri, Elgin's artist and agent. A medley of Greek and Levantine Italian was used in these jollities, though Byron directed his attention to learning Italian more than Greek in the youngsters' company.⁸ When in November 1810 his interpreter was sent away, Byron, left to his own devices,

³ J C Hobhouse, *Journey through Albania*, 1813, p 44. It is characteristic that the interpreter whom Byron's party engaged at Patras to accompany them to Albania was a Greek who knew no Turkish (*Ibid.*, 25)

⁴ Letter to his mother, Nov 12, 1809. He finds that modern Greek "differs much from the ancient, though radically similar."

⁵ Letter to Hodgson, May 5, 1810.

⁶ Letter to H. Drury, May 3, 1810.

⁷ Letter to his mother, July 30, 1810, to Hodgson, Nov 14, 1810.

⁸ Letter to Hobhouse, Aug 23, 1810, in Murray, *Lord Byron's Correspondance*, 1922.

found that his Greek was rather poor (*ἐπὶ καὶ ἔτσι*), and decided to study it with a tutor.⁹

Knowing that Byron's method of learning classical Greek and Latin at Harrow, and later Armenian in Venice consisted partly in making written translations, some of them in studied literary form, we may reconstruct to a certain extent the tools and the material used in his study of modern Greek from the titles of the books written in that language that he brought back to England, and from the fragments that he published as specimens in the "Remarks on the Romaic" The two groups include a Greek grammar or two, a modern Greek lexicon (Vendotti's trilingual dictionary in French, Italian, and Greek, in three volumes), a *Geography of Greece* by Meletius, a bishop of the eighteenth century, two or three plays, which actually seem to be Greek translations from Metastasio and Goldoni (one of them, Goldoni's *Bottega del Caffè*, translated by Spiridion Vlantı), a dramatic satire on the Greek priests, princes, merchants, and primates, short passages from Saint John's Gospel and the Lord's Prayer in the original and modern Greek, a list of over a hundred conversational phrases in Greek and English, the Greek "War Song" of Riga, which Byron gave in the original and also translated. We do not know how many of these translations were made in Athens. Evidently Byron intended to complete the modern Greek material of his Notes on Greece, and on returning to England he brought along with him his first Athenian interpreter, Demetrius Zografos, who during his one year's stay in England helped both Byron and Hobhouse in translating Greek texts, especially the *Geography* of Meletius, extensively used in Hobhouse's *Travels*¹⁰

How much Greek Byron may have learned cannot be definitely measured. The only evidence we possess, his own testimony, is not precise. After he had begun his study with a tutor, he writes rather proudly to his mother, on January 14, 1811, that he is "tolerably master of the Italian and modern Greek," and that he "can order and discourse more than enough for a reasonable man" To his

⁹ Letter to his mother, Jan 14, 1811; to Hobhouse (in Murray) Nov 26, 1810, and Jan 10, 1811

¹⁰ Byron's letters to Dallas, Aug 21, Sept 21, 1811, to John Murray, Aug 23, Sept 5, 1811, "Directions for the Contents of a Will," Aug 12, 1811, also (in Murray) letters to Hobhouse, June 19, July 5, Sept 20, Oct 22, Nov 16, and 17, Dec 3, and 17, 1811, etc

friend Hodgson, six days later, he does not hesitate to state that his Levantine Italian is "tolerably fluent," but he speaks more modestly of his "middling Romaine."¹¹ When later he repeatedly uses the term "gabbling" modern Greek, we may interpret it as meaning that he could use it sufficiently for his current needs and that he could venture into some sort of intelligent conversation with a man like his tutor, Marmarotouris.¹² As is natural with a person familiar with ancient Greek, he found the modern "so strikingly similar" to it "as a written language" and "so dissimilar in sound," that "even a few general rules concerning pronunciation would be of most extensive use"¹³ When he received, while still in Greece, and before he began to study with a tutor, a Cretan pastoral poem of the seventeenth century, he seemingly understood it enough to pass judgment on it,¹⁴ though we cannot be sure that he did not seek the help of interpreters in this. What he remembered of the language twelve years later could not be a good criterion. Yet, when he was about to go to Greece for the second time to help in her war of independence, he was still able to grasp "partly" the meaning of a letter written in modern Greek, though he felt the need of additional help. He explains "When I left Greece, in 1811, I could gabble Romaine pretty fluently, but have

¹¹ Letter of Jan. 20, 1811, in Murray.

¹² This merchant of Athens, one of the patriots working for the insurrection of the Greeks, endeavored with two others to publish a Greek translation of the Abbé Barthélemy's *Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis*, for the purpose of awakening the national feeling of his countrymen, by making them aware of their heritage. That he must have preached his gospel to Byron appears not only from the fact that the latter published the prospectus announcing this translation (Appendix to *Childe Harold*), and was apparently concerned with finding an editor for it in London, but also by the change in his opinion of the Greeks. He judges them more favorably during the last part of his stay in the country than before, and realizes that they were not cringing slaves, resigned to live for ever under the Turk, as he had presented them in the second canto of his *Childe Harold*, but that they were preparing for a revolt and had been cultivating a renaissance of knowledge and thought for several decades. Byron even endeavored to give the English public an idea of the literary efforts of the modern Greeks. We may safely assign to Marmarotouris a significant part in arousing the first signs of his philhellenism.

¹³ Review of Gall's *Geography of Ithaca and Itinerary of Greece*, in *Monthly Review*, Aug. 1811.

¹⁴ Letter to Hobhouse, Oct. 4, 1810.

been long out of habit, and would rather not trust to what I may recollect of it in a matter of this kind, where it is requisite to make as few mistakes as possible.¹⁵

When we consider that Byron had a more than average facility for languages, and that not only he heard Greek around him most of the time, during his residence of a year and a half in a country where that tongue was preponderant, but made efforts to learn it, we may reasonably conclude that he could use it passably well by the end of his stay, if not "fluently," as he claims. As for the three songs he translated, we must bear in mind that they contain a vocabulary richer than the ordinary, and we are led to conclude that, though he may have been familiar with the language, he must have sought not only the help of a dictionary, but also the guidance of his teacher, or the cooperation of the interpreter whom he brought back to England for just such tasks of translation.

Byron found modern Greek songs "some times pretty and pathetic, but their tunes generally displeasing to the ear of a Frank. The best is the famous 'Δεῦτε παῖδες τῶν Ἑλλήνων,' by the unfortunate Riga"¹⁶ His statement that his translation of this song is "as literal as the author could make it in verse" is true enough. But when he claims that "it is of the same measure as that of the original," he shows a curious confusion of meters.¹⁷ Instead of following the basic octosyllabic trochaic, Δεῦτε παῖδες τῶν Ἑλλήνων, Byron uses mostly the iambic, and reduces the syllables to six, as in these typical lines: "And worthy of such ties / Display who gave us birth" While admitting Byron's claim to closeness of translation, we find a few cases of noteworthy differences: "Let your country see you rising / And all her chains are broke" changes the meaning of "let us avenge every ignominious stain of our country," and presents, in relation to the context, less variety than the original. "Brave shades of chiefs and sages" omits the image of "scattered

¹⁵ Letter to Charles F. Barry, June 19, 1823

¹⁶ Note dated from Athens, March 17, 1811, *Poetry*, II, 199

¹⁷ *Poetry*, III, 20, note. This, added to his other assertion that modern Greeks have no idea of verse except in rhyme (Letter to Drury, May 3, 1810), leads us to doubt his ability to seize the rhythm of the Greek songs. Hobhouse shows indeed a more accurate sense of it, and rightfully boasts that his translation of the same song renders its basic trochaic, on the other hand, his takes more liberties with the original, and is inferior to Byron's. Cf. his *Travels*, Letter XXXIV.

spirits, souls." "Fight, conquer till we are free" is richer and more dynamic than the original "be victorious everywhere", moreover, Byron's line points beyond victory toward the ultimate end, freedom. "That chief of ancient song / Who saved you from falling / The terrible, the strong" successfully avoids the redundancy of the original "of the renowned hero, the much praised man." In the last stanza Byron prefers to remain closer to the historical truth than to the text. The Greek poet, far from suggesting the death of Leonidas and of his followers at Thermopylae, presents them as destroying the Persians and overcoming them. The notion of final disaster would not help to sustain the enthusiasm of those whom he tried to arouse. Byron had no such problem of tactics to face, and, besides, his English readers, who knew their history better than the common people among the Greeks, would expect a more accurate version of the heroic sacrifice. It is possible, of course, that Byron did not understand the text.

The translation of the Romaic song, which begins "I enter the garden of roses," was probably made in Athens. Byron states in his note accompanying it that he heard the Greek lines sung often by the young girls at the Athenian dances, and finds its air "plaintive and pretty." But here again, by reversing the meter, he changed its character. The trochaic octosyllabic with alternate catelexis, as it seems from the two only lines which he gives,

Μπένω μες' τὸ περιβόλι
Ὠραϊότατη Χαηδή,

is modified into an iambic. Moreover the translation has nine and eight syllables alternating, instead of eight and seven of the Greek. Since we have only two lines of the original, comparison is difficult. Yet we may safely assume that the Greek had a less learned word than that corresponding to "Flora," and that its spirit would have been rendered better, had more popular words been used throughout.

The original of the third song which begins "Oh Love was never yet without" is to be found in Pouqueville's *Voyage en Morée* (1805), and is followed by a French translation by the author of this book.¹⁸ The indication of this source by Hobhouse, in whose *Travels* Byron's translation first appeared, and the mention and

¹⁸ See Roy P. Basler, "The publication, date and source of Byron's 'Translation of a Romaic Love Song,'" *MLN*, LIII (1937), 503.

discussion of Pouqueville's work by Byron himself in his note dated from Athens, January 23, 1811, show that Byron had known it. Did he rely mainly on the Greek, or on the French translation? The latter is prosaic and meticulously faithful to the original in word and syntax. On the other hand Byron, while usually keeping close to the meaning, takes such liberties with expressions and syntax that it becomes difficult to determine which of the two texts he follows. In "while day and night roll darkling by" he reproduces the *crescendo* of *βραδείζει, ξημερώνει*, which is missing in "jour et nuit." On the other hand, "In flattering dreams I deemed thee mine" renders the French "je me flattais" rather than the Greek *θαπρώντας*. Also in "My bird of love! my beauteous mate" and in "My bird! relent" the order of words of both English and French differs from that of the Greek. These unimportant similarities between English and French show what we should expect, that Byron did not neglect to consult the French, though he may still have used his own knowledge of Greek and the help of others.

The translation of this love song adds nothing to the mediocrity of the original. The following changes he brought to it show in what respect Byron's spirit and upbringing kept him from following his model. The Greek often uses the word *καυμός*, "a devouring sorrow," and dwells at length upon the lover's sufferings, whereas Byron, more proudly, softens or even omits this notion entirely, describing instead the cruel attitude of the loved one. "Love deceiver and treacherous" is not rendered in the last line of stanza 3. Apparently it had not yet affected the translator. (His previous poems, far from showing him the victim of deceit, present him as trying to persuade the women to whom he addressed himself that instability of love is to be expected, both on account of external factors, such as forced separation, and because of love's own weakness. The first expression of indignation against deceit encountered among his known poems is found in "Remember thee," after his return to England.) Experiences and feelings familiar to a people dominated by absolutism, and subjected to bodily tortures and humiliations, are omitted by the English nobleman, or replaced by other notions. Phrases like "love seeks to torment," "my tormented body," are not rendered. "Have pity on me, do not torture me" is translated simply by "relent." "My humble heart" is replaced by "by bleeding breast," which is more romantic, and besides had been used previously by Byron. The feeling of injus-

tice brought out in the Greek by the fact that one heart exalts, while the other withers (to-day one would speak of the emotionally haves and have-nots), is not rendered in stanza 9. Finally, some words of an oriental tinge are changed "malady" is replaced by the less langorous and more spirited word "passion" in stanza 6. In short the tone of the original is more languid, more humble than that of the translation, and the same difference is reflected in the meter the thirteen syllables of the Greek line are reduced to eight, and whereas the rhythm of the original is mournful and weary, with words usually of three to five syllables, the English hits a rather impetuous note, with monosyllables predominating.

The above differences take on a more general import when we consider that Byron, throughout his poetry dealing with Greek and Near-Eastern themes, did not follow the oriental temper in its minor key, but struck a personal major key. And this seems to constitute the main difference between his orientalism and that contained in Beckford's *Vathek*, which he relished, and in the poems of More and Southey.¹⁹

It is natural then that we do not find the tone of these translated pieces in Byron's later works. But we do find a curious use of a modern Greek poem in one of his major creations. Professor D. C. Hesselning²⁰ is impressed by such close resemblances, in minor details of landscape effects, between the idyll of Haidee in *Don Juan*, II, stanza 112—IV, stanza 73, and the Cretan pastoral *ἡ Βοσκοπούλα* (printed as early as 1627 in Venice), that he thinks Byron knew and used the Greek poem. Corroboration of the happy deduction of the learned scholar of modern Greek literature may be found in the following passage of a letter Byron wrote when in Greece:

I have just received an epistle from Galt [then in Greece] with a Candist poem, which it seems I am to forward to you. This I would willingly do, but it is too large for a letter, and too small for a parcel, and besides appears to be damned nonsense, from all which considerations I will deliver it in person. It is entitled the 'Fair Shepherdess' or rather 'Herds-

¹⁹ Hobhouse condemned oriental passion altogether. He criticized Greek songs not only for their lack of classical simplicity and form, but also because they are "ardent, wild, and unconnected, with more poetry than sense, and more passion than poetry." *Travels*, p. 578.

²⁰ "Byron en een Nieuwgrieks Volklied," *Neophilologus*, XXIII (1938), 145 f.

woman', if you don't like the translation, take the original title *ἡ Βοσκοπούλα* ²¹

We may safely assume that when Byron, eight years later, sought local color for the Greek islands, where he sent his hero, he had recourse to the descriptions which struck him in reading the Cretan work. Either he remembered what he had read in 1810, or, more probably, having brought the poem from England or having found another copy in Venice, he had it in his hands in Venice as he wrote parts of *Don Juan*. This city was then the almost exclusive printing center of modern Greek books, and the *Βοσκοπούλα* itself had been printed there.

The use of this work by Byron is quite in keeping with his well-known practice of drawing from his readings for many of his descriptions. On the other hand, considering (as Galt has shown) that the poet describes much more vividly the places he himself has seen than those of which he has read, we may say that the real importance of Byron's trip to Greece lies in the persons and places he saw in the country, in his personal impressions. In this respect it may be worth recalling that, when he started on his tour, Greece had no place in his initial plans. He was to go to the Orient, as far as Persia and India (partly for the purpose of studying "India and Asiatic policy and manners"),²² and the itinerary after Malta included Constantinople and the interior of Asia. Greece and Albania were not considered until after he and Hobhouse had stopped at Malta. Was this change of plans due simply to the fact that a British ship happened to be sailing for Patras, and accommodations were offered to them on it? This is by no means a naive explanation (the course of many a traveler in the Levant at that time was radically changed by numerous accidental causes), and is to be found at the beginning of Hobhouse's *Travels*. But to this chance factor must be added the attraction Byron felt for Albania's ruler, Ali Pacha, whose legendary exploits were widely known in the Mediterranean, and whom the travelers sought to visit, braving the elements and mountains hard to traverse.²³ Thus Byron came across the regions which made the most powerful impression on him

²¹ Letter to Hobhouse from Patras, Oct. 4, 1810

²² Letters to his mother, Oct. 7, Nov. 2, 1810, to Hanson, Nov. 18, 1810

²³ Cf. Byron's letter to his mother, Sept. 15, 1809, from Malta, and the accounts of the visit to this powerful tyrant in his other letters and in *Childe Harold*, Book II, as well as in Hobhouse's *Travels*

during his whole travel the wild mountains of Epirus and Albania, and the differently beautiful sites of Delphi and Attica ²⁴

When we realize the importance that these lands take in his poetry, from *Childe Harold* to *Don Juan*, and more generally Byron's influence on orientalism in European literature, we may consider the unpremeditated change in his itinerary a happy stroke, in that it brought the poet in direct contact with the kind of sites and people who most appealed to his temperament. Indeed, his oriental heroes bear a closer resemblance to an Ali Pacha (haughty and amiable, generous and ruthless, and above all rebellious) than to any other oriental type. In this also Byron's orientalism is distinguished from that of his English contemporaries.

PANOS MORFHOPOULOS

The Johns Hopkins University

NOTES ON 41 SKINNER STREET

Skinner Street was already doomed to decay when Godwin moved his Juvenile Library into it in 1807. It was built only five years before to relieve traffic congestion between Holborn and the City, became an important thoroughfare at once, and in happier days might have been a profitable if not pleasant street. But time and circumstance so worked against it that there could hardly have been a more appropriate setting for Godwin's desolate attempts to keep his family and the Juvenile Library alive. It seems fitting that Skinner Street also was in desperate straits through his fifteen years' tenancy, and that his gloomy and crumbling house should have contributed notably to its dreariness, from his ejection in 1822 until house and street were destroyed in 1863.

The whole Skinner Street "development" was conceived in a deviousness that serves now as a dramatic foreshadowing of financial irregularity in Godwin, and at the time furnished the means of it. It was begun in 1801 when the street was cut between Snow Hill and Turnagain Lane ¹. Materials were cheap, spirits optimis-

²⁴ Letter to Drury, May 3, 1810, and elsewhere

¹ Turnagain Lane was as narrow as what is now left of it, Snow Hill was steep, winding and had three large posting inns. It curved up to the northeast from Holborn Bridge and south up to Skinner Street, which it

tic, the speculators invested too heavily and were caught short when war came in 1803, the houses on the Snow Hill-Skinner Street island still unfinished. They accordingly asked such high rents for the houses on the south side of the street that fewer than a quarter of them were occupied by 1805. In that year they petitioned to be allowed to dispose of the property by lottery. The Corporation approved, and persuaded Parliament to pass the City Lottery Act [46 Geo. 3. c. 97, 1806], which permitted the houses to be offered as prizes, vesting their ownership, until the drawings, in five trustees. The public, however, were so well acquainted with that method of disposing of questionable property that the drawings had to be postponed more than once. In 1809 Parliament amended the Act to allow the remaining properties to be sold at public auction [49 Geo. 3. c. 70 s. 7.]

The eleventh prize in the second division is described in the prospectus as "A Capital substantial Freehold Dwelling House, Land Tax redeemed, Situated at the North-east Corner of Skinner Street, with Circular Front, being Numbered 41, not occupied." The description is reasonably correct, for a prospectus. The house was unoccupied, and stayed so until Godwin moved his family into it from the Polygon, Somers Town.² Its vacancy, however, is much clearer than its substantialness. Only seven years later Thomas Jefferson Hogg, describing his first sight of Mary Shelley, called it crazy and ill-built. At any rate it was a large house of five stories, sufficiently handsome in the prospectus view. Its rounded front, on the corner of Snow Hill and Skinner Street, was ideal for book display. A contemporary, "Aleph" (William Harvey of Islington), has described its "immense extent of window-front," which was low enough "exactly to suit the capacity of a childish admirer." The stone carving over the door, representing Aesop reading his fables to a group of children, was probably put up during Godwin's tenancy. It is shown in a small blockprint

joined seventy yards or so to the west of the present junction. The Viaduct is now probably fifteen feet higher than Skinner Street at the old junction, which was separated from St Sepulchre by ten houses.

²The Polygon, a circular group of buildings in the centre of Clarendon Square, looked out over the fields to Camden Town in the time of Mary Wollstonecraft. Dickens has given the best picture of it as it was round 1840 when Harold Skimpole and his daughters lived there. It was torn down late in the century. The site is now occupied by four parallel rows of houses, very properly known as the Polygon Buildings.

used as a tailpiece in some of the Juvenile Library books, among others the Abbé Lefebvre's *Leçons pour les Enfants*³ Godwin mentions it in a letter to his wife in 1815 "Feel some love, some lingering of the heart for the corner house with the Aesop over the door."

No 41 should have been a good location, but unfortunately it was soon apparent that it was never going to be in a district of elegant shops. Most of the few buildings occupied when Godwin came were used as warehouses or manufactories. Snow Hill and its tributary lanes had been devoted for years to wholesale cheese-mongers, leather manufacturers and the like, and Skinner Street proceeded to develop chiefly in that direction, with an added tendency toward hosiers and wholesale linen-draperies (and a blacking-ball manufacturer, next to St. Sepulchre). In another way the locality was still worse—it was extensively given up to the practice and punishment of debt and crime. A hundred yards to the east of No 41 was the Giltspur Street Compter, where the Newgate debtors were transferred in 1815. Across from it was Newgate itself. Fleet Prison was round the corner off Fleet Market. The district to the northwest across Holborn Bridge, in Shoe Lane, Field Street and Saffron Hill, was squalid, unsavory and criminal—the scene of a good deal of the action of *Oliver Twist*. At the east end of Skinner Street, barely a hundred yards from No 41, the public executions were celebrated in the Old Bailey. The New Drop itself was probably just out of sight from Godwin's windows, but he could not avoid the spectators who assembled many times yearly. He missed the sensational execution of Governor Wall, who flogged a soldier to death in 1782, escaped arrest, gave himself up for trial in 1801 and was hanged in 1802, but there were too many other notorious scenes during his tenancy. In 1807 the hanging of Haggerty and Holloway for the murder of a lavender merchant drew a crowd in which twenty-eight people were suffocated or trampled to death and sixty injured. The ghastliest execution was probably that of the five Cato Street conspirators, who were

³ *Leçons pour les Enfants, ou Premiers Eléments de Morale, de Politesse, et de Sensibilité, en forme de Contes. Par Made F———* This is a translation of Mrs Fenwick's *Lessons for Children, or, Rudiments of Good Manners, Morals, and Humanity*, etc. The Abbé also translated the celebrated work of Mrs Taylor of Ongar. *Sollicitude d'une Mère, pour les plus précieux Intérêts de sa Fille.*

hanged and beheaded in 1820. In 1817 Cashman, a sailor, was hanged in front of the gunmaker's shop at 58 Snow Hill, which he had robbed during a riot—the last instance in England of execution at the scene of the crime. It was almost directly across the narrow street from No. 41.

"Who that could help it would live in Skinner Street?" a contemporary asks. In that setting the story of Fanny Imlay is laid, of Godwin and Francis Place, of Godwin and Shelley, and it was from there that Mary, Shelley and Jane Clairmont set out for France at five o'clock on that July morning of 1814, past the oil shops, floor-cloth manufacturers and oyster and orange warehouses.

By 1814 the street was past remedy. Some of the buildings had never been occupied at all. Commercial Hall, a large structure on the south side—it cost £25,000 and was the first prize in the lottery—burned down in 1813 and was never rebuilt. A Colonial Coffee House, with Coffee Mart and Sugar Warehouse in connection, flourished a little later at Nos 1 and 2, on the Fleet Market corner. Mr. John Theobald, the hosier at No. 11, is said to have become wealthy. In 1821 the blacking-ball manufacturer was still by St. Sepulchre, and there was an attorney in the street, a music-seller and an auctioneer. Even that added gentility brought no good for the Juvenile Library, it brought competition. The premises at No. 42, adjoining Godwin on Skinner Street, were occupied by John Wallis's Juvenile Repository, a stationer came in at No 16 on the south side, and from 1816 or 1817 John Major, Bookseller, was at No. 18, nearly opposite the Juvenile Library. It was in these years too that Godwin, in addition to his normal difficulties, got into trouble over the name of his business. There was at least one earlier Juvenile Library. The Post Office Annual Directory for 1819 lists him only as "M. J. Godwin & Co., Booksellers" (the cautious fiction that it was his wife's business was still preserved), and in 1820 the *Leçons pour les Enfants* was published by "The City Juvenile Library." The Directory for the next year gives a more impressive imprint under which his books were issued for some time: "The French and English City Juvenile Library (and Mapsellers in General)."

The chief difficulty was never with the Library, however. It was with the house. Godwin paid two quarters' rent in 1807 to a Mr. Rolfe. The "fortunate holders" of the house in the lottery were Messrs. Walsh and Nesbitt, stock-brokers, 1 Angel-court, Throg-

morton-street. It passed from them to now unknown persons referred to as "their assignees" in the bemuddled litigation that followed—the more bemuddled as Walsh and Nesbitt proceeded to go bankrupt. From them it was alleged to have passed to a Mr. Read, to whom, furthermore, Rolfe was alleged to have conveyed an interest that he had retained. The title was genuinely disputable. From 1808 on, consequently, there was a perplexing question, or a question that would have been perplexing to anyone else. to whom should the rent be paid? Godwin presented an answer philosophically simple and economically profitable for fifteen years he declined to pay rent at all. The defence of his representative, Mr. Joshua Evans, was substantially that no matter in whom the title lay, it did not lie in Read, who claimed to have purchased from the assignees of Walsh and Nesbitt but had neither a conveyance from them nor a direction from them to enable the trustees to convey.

That situation held until 13 August, 1817, when the trustees executed a conveyance in Read's favor. The assignees disappear from the cloudy picture, Godwin still refused to pay. At the London Sittings early in 1822, before Lord Chief Justice Abbot, Read successfully prosecuted a suit for ejectment to recover possession. Godwin carried it into the Court of King's Bench. On 1 May, 1822, Mr. Joshua Evans argued that Read could not show title. He had no proof derived from the "fortunate holders" or their assignees, and Rolfe's conveyance was invalid, as the property was not Rolfe's but had passed to the trustees, and the conveyance of 1817 was unproved. There was another claim. Under the Lottery provisions the trustees were required to fill vacancies in their number "by the election of some other person or persons", but at the time of Read's conveyance one of them (Sir John William Anderson, Bart.) was "admittedly dead," and no successor had been elected.

The three justices (Sir George Sowley Holroyd absent in Chambers) saw no reason to set aside Read's verdict. Mr. Justice Bayley was of opinion that the election of new trustees was only a directory clause. Abbott, Chief Justice, concurred in explaining his previous ruling. "... Though there was no proof of [the fortunate holders'] execution of the conveyance, still I thought that there was sufficient title in the plaintiff without their execution; and that if I were to presume any thing, it was to be in favour of the title of the lessor of the plaintiff against the defendant, who had no title at all." [Dowling and Ryland, I. 259.]

That was the result of what Mrs Shelley, in a letter to a respected friend who had to be deceived, so characteristically called "an impossible-to-be lost law suit" . . . Godwin having absolutely no right of any sort on his side. The family and Library had to be removed within two days, and No. 41 Skinner Street was never occupied again.

Read naturally proceeded to collect as much of his rent as he could. The ejectment was followed by a judgment for rent from 1820 to 1822, and in 1825 by a second judgment for rent from 1817 to 1819, all of course with costs. The last Godwin again appealed, on the same grounds, and again lost [Law Journal III. K. B. 128, 129.]. It is hard to see who could have advised him to appeal, or who was likely to profit by doing so, except Mr Joshua Evans. The final judgment was a particularly hard blow. His friends from whom he could borrow had abandoned him long before, and Shelley was dead. To get together the new sum of more than £400 he had to sacrifice nearly all his copyrights.

Fortunately Read could not collect his rent for any period before 1817, when his conveyance was executed, and Godwin escaped scot-free for the nine and a half years from 1808. As that was worth about £1900 to him, Read may be considered his heaviest contributor next to Shelley.

The closing of the Juvenile Library began the last period of the decay of Skinner Street, according to "Aleph." "The whole army of shutters looked blankly on the inquirer, and forbade even a single glance at 'Sinbad' or 'Robinson Crusoe' It would soon be re-opened—we naturally thought—but the shutters never came down again. . . . Gradually the glass of all the windows got broken in, a heavy cloud of black dust—solidifying into inches thick—gathered on sills, and doors, and brickwork, till the whole frontage grew as gloomy as 'Giant Despair's Castle' Not long after, the adjoining houses shared the same fate, and they remain, from year to year, without the slightest sign of life—absolute scarecrows, darkening with their uncomfortable shadows the busy streets."

"Aleph" wondered with some eloquence if such "doomed dwellings" sheltered strange guests. "Do wretches 'unfriended by the world or the world's law' seek refuge in these deserted nooks, mourning in the silence of despair over their former lives . . . ?" We happily know that Godwin at least, a man of practised equa-

nimity, was hardly likely to have disturbed himself so greatly. The affair of Skinner Street was only a major disaster in the series over which he triumphed for thirty years.

FORD K. BROWN

*St John's College,
Annapolis, Md*

SHAKESPEARE FORBEARS

In most fields of thought there is progress or something like it the novelty or heresy of one age becomes the commonplace or dogma of the next. Of criticism, practised now for over two thousand years, that can scarcely be said. How little here can be taken for granted! In all forms of communication, even a play or story, there should be some common ground, something familiar as a starting-point; and in criticism there ought, by this time, to be certain accepted premises from which to proceed, certain established fundamental principles upon which to build. But the critic knows scarcely where to begin or where to end, when (or rather, when not) to turn aside for the purpose of guarding against opposition or misconception. If he is an adherent of pure impressionism, indeed, he and his reader may have no common ground at all, and you would think there would be no beginning. But however little he believes in aesthetic truth generally, he does and would have you believe in his own. In fact, though furtively and inconsistently, something or other he takes for granted. The "rules" of the eighteenth century are no more, but something of the sort is indispensable. Feeling of itself will not carry him far, in a reader's company. For practical purposes he must refer to a standard. That may be the conscious or unconscious intention of the author, or the work of art as a reflection of the author's experience, or of the time and place, or of any time and place. In short, he is biographical, historical, psychological, or philosophical, or all of these together. He cannot, however, count on his reader's being so. The result is that criticism is as bewildering as it is bewildered, and so is pretty thoroughly discredited; no one wants to read it, still less buy it, unless he receives a trustworthy guarantee, and the most generally acceptable one is the name on the title-page not of a critic but of another author. Then the criticism is not so much itself as literature,

but thus it may at least be illumined and safeguarded by a knowledge of the ways of authorship.

All that has been said is pre-eminently true—that much I now take for granted—in relation to Shakespeare. Of him anybody writes anything, not only of the man himself but his creation, as of God and his, and to judge from the variety of the readings Shakespeare's page, which is said to be Nature, is quite as mysterious and undecipherable as Nature itself. If any criticism is bewildered it is this, and I need not labour the point. Even here, however, we can, with a little patience, make distinctions, and perceive some traces of order—of progress. Certain living figures dominate, certain weighty opinions are beginning to prevail. Mackail and Elton, MacCarthy and Eliot, Murry and Abercrombie, John Palmer and Granville Barker will not warrant abuses that used to be readily or helplessly permitted, or at least will not warrant them when practised by others. Such are the confusion of art and life in the form of speculations upon the hero's experience before the play begins or (in comedy) after it is over, the identification of characters with the dramatist himself or his contemporaries, the influence of heredity and environment upon the hero, the intrusion of nineteenth-century philosophy, *Kulturgeschichte*, psychology, or psychoanalysis into the characters or the action.

These are negative rather than positive principles, but the former are nearly as important, and I wonder whether another taboo for which I am now pleading might not be included among them. This is only a special application of two above mentioned—those on the confusion of art and life and the intrusion of psychology. This is one on the intrusion of sex matters, which have now overrun all our thinking and writing.

A reputable scholar has of late taken the position that Iago really suspected Othello of corrupting his wife, Emilia, and with good reason for it. To argue either point, I think, is needless. Before expressing the opinion, the villain has both betrayed and avowed his own unscrupulous duplicity, in expressing it he admits that he knows not if it be true and yet "for mere suspicion in that kind will do as if for surety"; and presently he invokes the power of hell and night as the devil-in-the-flesh which all the most enlightened critics from Coleridge and Lamb to J. J. Chapman, Lytton Strachey, and John Palmer have taken him to be.

Of the same offense he in turn suspects Cassio too, and manifestly that is his way and bent. Even those who, like Bradley, endeavour to humanize and psychologize him do not generally think he believed Othello guilty, still less that he had reason to do so.

What concerns me here is not the particular interpretation but the critical attitude; for that purpose only I touch upon the evidence—"There is nothing in the play to contradict it or make it impossible." The man is a soldier, a creature of flesh and blood; middle-aged and, prior to the opening of the play, unmarried. There is no reason to think him physically incapable.

Now all this raises questions not raised by the dramatist and takes us outside the tragedy, or, so to speak, behind the scenes. Iago indeed has raised the question of a fact (not of an *a priori* probability) but by his own admissions and self-betrayals has answered it. Had it been part of the tragedy—really touched the character—it would, according to Shakespeare's dramatic method, have been answered, one way or the other, in no uncertain terms. The only questions in his plays left open, except through hastiness and carelessness, are those put by the critics themselves.

"Nothing in the play to contradict it?" The whole tenor of it does. Othello is a high-romantic warrior and lover, and such hard-headed realistic considerations occur not to the spectator but to the present-day reader. That is because he does not surrender to the romantic spell, or follow the dramatic movement, but pauses and looks up from the page; or because he reads it as if a modern novel, where a character is planted in sociologically appropriate environment, or as if either a modern novel or play, where the sexual experience or background omitted would be missed. Or else because of all this together, on the basis of the notion, now rife among the knowing, that a middle-aged celibate, in a monastery or out of it, is either "irregular" or "abnormal." But a generation ago, whether in reality or in fiction, a middle-aged bachelor could still hold up his head, and of a great and manly American preacher it used to be reported, while yet there was no fear of Freud and Oedipus was but a prey to fate and mistaken identity, that according to his own words he had not married because he never met a woman like his mother. The story would not have the same effect upon an audience today. Had Shakespeare himself, to be sure, at the *Mermaid*, been asked whether in real life a stalwart veteran would have preserved his chastity, he might, without

the scholar's up-to-date psychology and physiology to support him, have likewise shaken his head. But he wouldn't have thought ill of him if he had, and what is more important, as dramatist he here says not a word about it. In any case, Othello, Desdemona's lover, in this high-romantic Venice and Cyprus, entangled with Emilia, his subaltern's wife, in whom he shows no interest, of whom he has no memories,—that would have made a very different and incoherent play.

A great difference between Shakespearean drama and the modern lies, so far as the subject-matter is concerned, in its not ordinarily involving the characters' sex record, and so far as the technique, in its not being suggestive in procedure. The young lovers, like Romeo, Orlando, and Florizel, though not Galahads, have evidently had no compromising relations with women, and the same may be said of older ones like Orsino and (though the Freudian would sniff and prick up his ears at his inquisitorial and reforming spirit) the Duke in *Measure for Measure*. By "suggestive" I do not mean anything prurient or corrupting. Of that to be sure there is little or nothing in Shakespeare. The insidiously or lingeringly erotic or voluptuous?—as with most Elizabethans, impropriety takes the direct, momentary, unprovocative form of jokes. What I do mean is that there is little suggestion whether of sexual or any other matters by way of the connections or implications of the play.

Shakespeare's dramatic fabric, said Maeterlinck years ago, is "wide and loose", and a case in point is Hamlet in his relations with Ophelia. Almost everything conceivable has been said about him, but so far as I am aware no important critic has yet dared to say he had seduced her, though two reputable German men of letters, Tieck and Boerne, did. Why not, though? Here, really, "there is nothing in the play to contradict it" and much, it might seem, to confirm it. Early in the action both her brother and her father warn her, and not so much against losing her heart to him as her virtue. He, in turn, playing mad, warns the wiseacre himself not to let her walk in the sun, in allusion to its traditional impregnating power; asks her whether she is "honest" (or virtuous), then bids her get her to a nunnery, avowing that he loved her once, only to disavow it, and jests intimately and indecently with her at the theatrical performance. She, heart-broken after her father's death, and mad in reality, sings songs about true-loves,

Saint Valentine's Day, and opening the chamber door. All that is lacking is the hero's remorse, but for the psychologists that would be a trifle, and if, just as it is (inconceivable!) the play were in French or German, whether of 1603 or any date since, Ophelia would be another Gretchen. Goethe, though imitating Ophelia, was writing in the spirit of his time and country, which was Tieck's and Boerne's, and what saves Ophelia for us from that is mainly the stage tradition, less interrupted through the three centuries in its effect upon *Hamlet* than upon *Othello*. In the spirit of early criticism and despite that of the later, Hamlet is to us, as to our play-going fathers and grandfathers, a romantic, not a realistic hero, and Ophelia a delicately romantic heroine, both, moreover, not of the "courtly" order, like Lancelot and Guinevere, Tristram and Isolt, but of the Elizabethan, like Romeo and Juliet, Orlando and Rosalind, the lovers in Greene and Lyly. Ophelia's ditties are not her own, but snatches of folk song, familiar to the audience, and her memory is merely that of the crazy, for what they have never repeated before. That trait of insanity Shakespeare knew of, as we all do, without any psychology of the subconscious; and the only inner significance here is in her thoughts running upon "young men," with one of whom she has manifestly been in love. And the other apparent indications of a seduction only serve the purposes of the main story—the warnings of father and brother lead to her repulsing Hamlet, which thereupon gives him a pretext for playing mad for love of her, which then in the succeeding scenes he continues to do. The details hang together so far as the revenge affair is concerned but not the love affair. This, incidentally, is a remarkable example of Aristotle's principle, which by most critics Shakespeare is supposed to contradict, that plot comes first, and tragedy is primarily an imitation not of character but action. Not that in characterization the dramatist restricts himself to the requirements of the action, Hamlet's discursiveness, his interest in the life about him, his love and admiration for his friends, his anxiety for the welfare of his mother and his sweetheart, prove the contrary, but not everything in the action contributes, as in Ibsen, to the characterization, and in particular, there is no dependence, for that purpose, upon the connections or implications of it. Even apart from the sexual, this is true, and Banquo, in a tragedy played before the newly enthroned King, his descendant, is not the assassin's accomplice.

If, then, where by modern standards a sexual relation seems suggested it really isn't, what of *Othello*, where the suggestion is lacking? More than suggestion, indeed, would have been needed to make one of Shakespeare's heroes appear to the Elizabethan audience to have betrayed the heroine or to have had a vulgar adulterous *liaison*. More still would have been needed to make it acceptable.

Macbeth in his relations to his Lady is another case in point. A man and a woman desperately conspiring together, to win a crown by a murder—what an opportunity thrown away! In Shakespeare it might almost as well (but not quite, as we shall see) have been a sister. The Lady shames her husband, dominates him, moves him to admiration and emulation, but she does not fascinate him, lure him, or set the murder as the price of her favour. She brings no amorous enticements to bear upon him beforehand and showers no amorous distractions upon him afterwards. She has little of Browning's Ottima in her or Milton's Eve. As the woman sinner contrasted with the man, she is like them both. She too has less of reason and imagination, less of conscience or of regard for law or honour. She too is more personal and practical, reckless and defiant. But unlike them, she does not now love the man more because of the crime or exult in it as proof of his love for her. And Duncan in his blood she does not hate as Ottima does Luca and as Eve, in her disobedience, fairly does God and the angels. By their exhilaration or resentment they smother some of their sense of guilt—the Lady, like her husband, is herself overwhelmed. But that is not the way the French actress played her. In the sleep-walking scene "to bed, to bed, to bed" was given what was for the actress the natural meaning but for Shakespeare would have been all-too natural.

This enrichment is not in the Elizabethan's vein. A modern dramatist would have made them lovers or, as in Browning, paramours. They are but man and wife, the relation which, as Hazlitt said of Milton's Adam and Eve's, is "the least interesting of all others." And yet even with that load to carry Milton comes closer to our art, if not to us. Shakespeare is more austere. The only reminders of the marital relation are the Lady's words.

From this time
Such I account thy love

and

I have given suck, and know
How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me,

as she drives him on, and

My husband!

as she acclaims him entering with blood on his hands. That he is still, as well as the traitor and assassin which she had made of him! He and she are now doubly bound together, and by her homely outcry all that they have been in the past is flung into contrast with what they are at this moment. The situation here, and in "to bed, to bed, to bed" as in somnambulist's retrospect she hears the knocking, is simpler than it would have been made by the moderns, but is complicated enough. It is more steeply tragical. It is murder, murder, and their love is swallowed up in the horror of it.

These deeds must not be thought
After these ways, so, it will make us mad,

she now cries out in alarm at the effect upon him waking or sleeping, she thinks it all over to the point of madness herself. Eve and Ottima have another thing or two to think about and feel.

In this conception of drama Shakespeare (but not of course because of any "influence") is like the ancients. His "romantic" art is like the classical in its simplicity, its intensity. As with Aeschylus and Sophocles, his tragic heroines are not in the foreground, often the heroes, such as Macbeth, Lear, Timon, Brutus, and Coriolanus, are not lovers, and none of the heroes or heroines, either, except Antony and Cleopatra has clearly had a "love-life." The change comes with Shakespeare's successors, Beaumont and Fletcher, Ford and Webster, as with Euripides, and in the Restoration dramatists there is suggestion besides. In Shakespearean tragedy love is seldom an issue. The dramatist might have let Ophelia stand between the Danish Prince and his revenge—love against duty, as in Corneille and Racine, but though she serves to shed a light upon his character she is only a pawn in his game against Claudius and Polonius, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. Not for want of interest in the subject as, in some measure, with the ancients. Shakespeare is what Mr. Murry calls him, the laureate of love. His sonnets, his comedies, and still more his tragedies are the proof. But because of his own taste and that of his public he

is shy of studying the passion or analysing it, of dramatizing it or making it the centre and pivot of either tragedy or comedy. For him (in his plays at least) it suffers from few doubts or questionings, few internal struggles or vicissitudes, and (except through others' trouble-making) still fewer treasons or defeats. He is romantic, fairly simple and reverential in his attitude. He sings of love, and gives love its own individual voice to sing. In his comedies, in *Othello* and *Romeo and Juliet*, there is the finest love-making in the world, but generally from a distance, whether in fact or in thought—by way of narrative such as the Moor's story, through disguise and impersonations, such as Rosalind and Orlando's, or as one on the balcony and the other in the garden, with seldom a suggestion of a caress, kiss, or sensuous imagination between them. And "a past," as in Victorian parlors it was gingerly called, which is now allowed for in all our novels, that is as seldom to be met with in Shakespearean high society as it was in those parlors themselves. Falstaff and Shallow are the sort that have it, with their memories of Jane Nightwork and Saint George's field.¹

The matter under discussion is, then, partly one of structure, partly one of romantic integrity. The taboo, in the first place, was, whether consciously or unconsciously, observed by Shakespeare himself, as well as the other early Elizabethans and the ancients; and there lies the reason—in criticism are reasons often so good and simple?—why in dealing with them it should be observed by the critic in turn.

ELMER EDGAR STOLL

The University of Minnesota

SOURCES OF TAHUREAU'S LYRICS¹

*Dialogues non moins profitables que facétieux*² made the name of Jacques Tahureau famous for a half a century after his early

¹ The subject of this paragraph is discussed more fully in my *Shakespeare's Young Lovers* (1937), Chapters 1 and 2.

² The material of this article forms part of a Master of Arts dissertation written under the guidance of Dr Léon Baisier of the Department of Romance Languages of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D C.

³ First published by Maurice de la Porte, as *Les Dialogues de feu J Tahureau, gentilhomme du Mans, non moins profitables que facétieux, où*

death in 1555. They have kept him a place in histories of French literature. But the ironic popularity of these two prose essays, posthumously published as they were, was not paralleled by the fate of the young Manceau's three small volumes of poetry. He had lived on the fringe of the Pléiade, an intimate friend of Baif, at one time a devoted admirer of his own distant relative, Pierre de Ronsard. While he was among them, Tahureau's acquaintances were lavish in their praise of his *Premières poésies* and his *Sonnets, odes et magnardises amoureuses de l'Admirée*—even of his *Oraison au roy de la grandeur de son règne et de l'excellence de la langue françoise*. Contemporary admiration carried these three little books through seven printings before 1602. From that time till the present, in spite of M. Prosper Blanchemain's republication of the poems³ and his 'discovery' of the identity of 'l'Admirée,'⁴ so summarily refuted by M. Henri Chardon⁵ and M. Emile Besch,⁶ the lyrics of Jacques Tahureau have been thought unworthy of notice, utterly lacking in originality.

However, the modern enthusiasm for Ronsard that culminated in 1924 in the celebration of the fourth centenary since his birth has called forth from M. Marcel Raymond a new estimate of the importance of Tahureau's poetry. M. Raymond thinks it greater than that of Jodelle, of Magny, even perhaps of Baif.⁷ In an effort to establish a basis for this discussion of the originality of

les vices d'un chacun sont repris fort asprement pour nous animer d'avantage à les fuir et à suivre la vertu (Paris, G. Buon, 1565). Recently they have been reprinted as *Les Dialogues de Jacques Tahureau, gentilhomme du Mans*, avec notice et index par F. Conscience (Paris, Alphonse Lemerre, 1870).

³ *Poésies de Jaques Tahureau*, publiées par Prosper Blanchemain (Paris, Jouaust, 1870, 2 vols.). M. Blanchemain issued a limited edition at Geneva in 1868 and 1869, it was published by J. Gay et fils. All references in the present article designate pages of the Paris edition.

⁴ Cf. the "Lettre à Théodore de Banville" in *Poésies de J. T.*, I, xvii. This same biographical notice was republished in Prosper Blanchemain, *Poètes et Amoureuses, portraits littéraires du XVI^e siècle* (Paris, Willem, 1877, 2 vols.), I, 9-11.

⁵ H. Chardon, "La Vie de Tahureau Documents inédits sur sa famille, son mariage et l'Admirée," *Revue historique et archéologique du Maine*, xvi (1884), 347-349.

⁶ E. Besch, "Un moraliste satirique et rationaliste au XVI^e siècle. Jacques Tahureau (1527-1555)," *RSS.*, vi (1919), 14.

⁷ Marcel Raymond, *L'Influence de Ronsard sur la poésie française* (Paris, Champion, 1927, 2 vols.), I, 208, note 1.

Tahureau's poems, I have examined all the lyrics of the poets he mentions with the exception of Ovid and of Ariosto, whose relation to Tahureau has been studied by Dr. Cameron.⁸ Of all the Greek, Roman, Italian and French poets that Tahureau admired, relatively few influenced his poetry, so far as one may judge by similarity of phrase.

To begin with the Greeks Tahureau's verse is redolent of brief phrases probably inspired by the *Greek Anthology*, which he could have known only in the Planudean edition, since the Palatine Ms. was not found until 1607. Especially the amatory epigrams seem to have been familiar to him—we learn from his biographer Maurice de la Porte that he read Greek with ease.⁹ But their phraseology was so embedded in the love poetry of all the Renaissance that it has become a commonplace, and one cannot say with certainty that Tahureau learned it directly from them. Nevertheless, as Mr. James Hutton has observed,¹⁰ one epigram undoubtedly found its way into the poet's playful reproach.

φλέξει τις πυρὶ πῦρ

A P 16 251

says the anonymous Greek, of love, and Tahureau ejaculates 'A une damoiselle qui brulla les "Amours" de J.-A. de Baif':

. Pensoys-tu ce feu d'aymer
Par autre feu consumer? I, 165

It seems to me that many others of the epigrams must have been at least in the back of the poet's mind as he wrote. This may be evidenced by the following comparisons between M. Blancheman's 1870 edition of Tahureau and the modern Palatine *Anthology*: Ode I (A. P. 5. 10), *Baiser* II (A. P. 5. 3), Sonnet XI (A. P. 5. 28), Sonnet XII (A. P. 5. 15), *Sonnet LXXXIII* (A. P. 5. 64), Contre quelques uns qui le blamoyent. (A. P. 9. 62), A Jacques Hoyau (A. P. 5. 72), A Mademoiselle Ysabeau d'Hauteville (A. P. 5. 70, 5. 95, 5. 146, 9. 26, 9. 66, 9. 506, 9. 571, 16. 283).

⁸ Alice Cameron, *The Influence of Ariosto's Epic and Lyric Poetry on Ronsard and His Group* (Baltimore, 1930), pp 161-165

⁹ Cf the epistle to "Monsieur M François Pierron, grand-vicaire de Monseigneur l'abbé de Molesmes," reprinted in the *Dialogues*, éd Conscience, p 17

¹⁰ James Hutton, *The Influence of the Greek Anthology* Doctoral dissertation at Cornell University, June, 1927 Typewritten Cf p 269, note, and p. 432

As far as individual Greek authors are concerned, only Callimachus and Pindar could have been entirely at Tahureau's disposal in a Greek text¹¹ Even Anacreon was published just too late, as Sainte-Beuve regretfully remarked.¹² Alcaeus, Sappho, Simonides contain phrases that he may have used, but the similarity is too general to be called evidence, except perhaps in this distich from the last-mentioned

μνήμη δ' οὐτινὰ φημι Σιμωνίδῃ ἱσοφαρίζειν
ὀδυκονταέτει παιδὶ Λεωπρέπεος . ¹³

To this Tahureau scornfully retorts:

Je ne quiers point de ce grand Simonide
Le souvenir II, 31.

There is a resemblance between Callimachus's description¹⁴ of the birth of Apollo and Tahureau's jubilant picture of the birth of Jodelle (I, 108) Pindar, Anacreon, Archilochus, Stesichorus—all of whom the Frenchman names admiringly—do not appear to have furnished him any phrases. Probably Musaeus's *Hero and Leander*, so popular with the French Renaissance, inspired Tahureau's clever 'Ode IV,' but the likeness is not definitive, and may have come by way of Marot.

With the Roman poets whose work he knew, the French lyricist took more liberties. Not only did he profess a great admiration for Horace, he proved his sincerity by borrowing whole verses from the Latin odes, especially the first book—as here, where the poet is described:

. nunc viridi membra sub arbuto
stratus, nunc ad aquae lene caput sacrae . . .
Carmina, I, 1.¹⁵

Tahureau echoes

Bien luy plaist l'azur d'un ruisseau
Et le paisible frais ombrage
D'un verd boucageux arbrisseau . I, 120

¹¹ Raoul Morçay, *La Renaissance* (Paris, 1933, 2 vols.), I, 145

¹² C-A. Sainte-Beuve, *Œuvres*, éd Jules Troubat (Paris, 1876, 2 vols.), II, 308

¹³ *Lyra Graeca*, newly edited and translated by J M Edmonds (London and New York, 1922-1927, 3 vols.), II, 388

¹⁴ *Callimaque Hymnes-Epigrammes-Les Origines-Hécalé-Iambes-Poèmes lyriques*. Texte établi et traduit par Emile Cahen (Paris, 1922), 75.

¹⁵ *Horace Tome I, Odes et épodes* Texte établi et traduit par F Ville-neuve (Paris, 1927).

Some of the Latin apothegms so familiar to the present generation of classicists were evidently bywords to Tahureau

Permitte divis cetera
Quid sit futurum cras, fuge quaerere *Carmina*, I, 9.

This he repeats to Jacques Hoyau:

Laissons, amy, tel soing extremes
Tuons le soucy et la cure
De la chose qui est future I, 125

Horace's famous description of the man single-minded in the simplicity of a high purpose,

Integer vitae scelerisque purus *Carmina*, I, 22,

Tahureau adopts in his lyric 'A Monsieur l'abbé des Chasteliers, Baptiste Tiercelin':

Celui qui, avec le sçavoyr
Peut l'esprit innocent avoyr,
Et net d'entreprise méchante

Certes tu as les deux ensemble,
La doctrine et l'esprit entier I, 48, 49

There are evidences of further borrowing, I think, in the following groups of poems *Des vices de nostre age* (*Carmina* I, 35), *A Jaques de Cottier* (*Car.* IV, 3), *Contre quelques uns qui le blamoient . . .* (*Car.* IV, 9), *De la vanité des hommes* (*Car.* I, 34, IV, 7), *Contre un pernicieux détracteur* (*Epodon*, 6).

Catullus and Tibullus, popular as they were with his contemporaries, seem hardly to have influenced Tahureau, though he invoked their names quite often in his poetry. But Propertius was a favorite of his. Both his infatuation and his jealousy follow the Latin model with an almost scrupulous fidelity that is oddly naïve. Typical of his familiarity with Propertius is this passage.

At me non aetas mutabit tota Sibyllae,
non labor Alcidae, non niger ille dies
Tu mea compones et dices: 'Ossa, Propertii,
haec tua sunt, eheu!'
Elegiae, II, 24, lines 33-36 ¹⁰

¹⁰ *Propertius, Elégies* Texte établi et traduit par D. Paganelli (Paris, 1929).

Tu me plaindras, en vain lors pitoyable II, 61, 62

Elegiae, II, 5, lines 25-30

II, 25, 26

¹⁸ Besch, *loc cit.*, p. 16, note.

borrowings from the Italian and nearly half of those not from Petrarch, but from Ariosto. The concepts of love that Tahureau shares with Petrarch are not the deeply spiritual thoughts characteristic of the latter, but rather the more commonplace, such as this.

E l'imagini lor son sì cosparte
Che volver non mi posso, ov' io non veggia
O quella, o simil indi accesa luce¹⁹

Similarly, Tahureau says:

Vers quelque part que mes pas j'achemine,
Toujours me suit ton idole divine. II, 59

A likeness perceptibly closer appears by the juxtaposition of Petrarch's Sonnet CLXXXV to Tahureau's Sonnet XI:

Onde tolso Amor l'oro, e di qual vena,
Per far due traccie bionde, e'n quali spine
Colse le rose ?

En quel fleuve areneux jaunement s'écouloit
L'or qui blondist si bien les cheveux de madame?

Mais en quel beau jardin la rose qui donne ame
A ce tent vermeillet le matin s'étaloit? II, 12

There are six other passages that the Frenchman seems to have borrowed from his great Italian predecessor: Sonnet VI (*Pet.* Sonnet III), Sonnet XXII (*Sonnet XXXI*), Sonnet XLIII (*Son. XXV*), Ode V (*Son. XXVIII*), Ode III (*Son. CXXXVII*), Sonnet LXI (*Son. CV*). Perhaps the fact that there are no more is to be explained by M. Vianey's theory²⁰ that the French poets of the Renaissance were not so familiar with Petrarch himself as they were with Italian Petrarchists of their own period. It may be, too, that Tahureau did know Petrarch, but found his love sonnets a bit too ethereal for imitation.

That hypothesis, however, would not account for the paucity of his borrowings from Ariosto. Dr. Cameron's monograph points out six passages which Tahureau apparently took from the Italian.²¹

¹⁹ Jacques-Langlois, *Les Sonnets amoureux de Pétrarque, traduits en sonnets français avec le texte italien en regard* (Paris, 1936), p. 103.

²⁰ J. Vianey, *Le Pétrarquisme en France au XVI^e siècle* (Paris and Montpellier, 1909), pp. 7, 11.

²¹ Cameron, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-165.

The author herself says that more would be expected, but offers an interesting suggestion to explain their absence.

What certainly might be anticipated in a member of Ronsard's 'Brigade' is an interest in contemporary French poetry. True to his environment, Tahureau derived a full third of his borrowed phrases from his French friends. Ronsard in particular had a great influence upon him, as has been demonstrated by M. Marcel Raymond in an exhaustive study.²² Some ten of the passages listed by M. Raymond fulfill our definition of 'source'—i. e., they recur, word for word, in Tahureau's poetry.

Really quite as prominent as Ronsard in Tahureau's writing is Joachim du Bellay, whose absence in Italy drew from his young friend an eloquent ode. The genius of Du Bellay, nevertheless, differed considerably from that of Tahureau, and only fragmentary phrases—13 of them—are transferred from the *Olive* and the various early *Recueils de poésie* to the volumes of the latter.

It was an intimate friend, Jean-Antoine de Baif, who wielded the strongest French influence on Tahureau's poetry. His *Amours de Meline* exhibit no less than seven passages that suggest the verse of Tahureau, and the *Amours de Francine*, which appeared a year later than Tahureau's first two volumes, contain six sections that Baif may have culled from his comrade. Unquestionably the two young men were much alike in their manner of expressing their love; but surely Tahureau was intellectually keener than his friend. Just compare their two versions of the same idea—Baif's is first:

Je feray que nulle ancienne
Ne s'élèvera dessus toy
Je feray que la gloire tienne,
Pour t'avoir obligé ma foy,
Bien peu d'envie portera
A la plus brave, qu'on lira
De nostre temps avoir eu l'heur
De gagner d'un Poète le cœur ²³

Observe how Tahureau grows specific:

Lalage aussi, Lesbie et la Cynthie,
Corinne belle, Euridice et Delie,

²² Raymond, *op cit*, I, 197-209 and *Bibliographie critique de Ronsard en France (1550-1585)* (Paris, Champion, 1927), pp 137-138

²³ Ch. Marty-Laveaux, *Œuvres en rime de Jean Antoine de Baif* (Paris, 1881), I, 200-201.

Laure, Cassandre, Olive et la Melne,
 Perdent adonc de la beauté le prix
 Par celle là qu'admirent mes espi12

II, 91

The margin of error probable in a study such as the present one is unquestionably large, still, I think I have proved that a majority of the sources of Tahureau's poetry were his own reflections. Though he was conversant with Greek, Latin, Italian and French lyric poetry, and borrowed from all of it, yet these borrowed passages occur in 68, at most, of the 197 poems between the covers of his three small volumes. Just 35 per cent of his ideas, roughly, were not his own—and this in the early days of the Renaissance, when imitation was an author's goal and plagiarism rather an achievement than a fault! Careful comparison of his poems with the original passages that they resemble reveals Jacques Tahureau as a constructive thinker who habitually chose phrases from his reading as the bases upon which to build new compositions. This does not, of course, prove him a poet of the first—nor even the second nor the third—order, in my opinion, nothing will ever establish that title. But he was ahead of his time—in advance of Ronsard himself—in the independence of his poetic judgment. Witness his own words

Assez vrayment, au fort de mon souci,
 Pindare, Horace, et vous, Pétrarque, aussi,
 J'ay voulu suyvre et piller vostre lire,
 Advienne ainsi qu'un jour tous nos neveux
 Aillent suyvant de près-à-près les vœux
 Dont ma Pallas sans vostre ayde j'admire

II, 57

SISTER MARY DAVID CAMERON, S.S.N.D

College of Notre Dame of Maryland

THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE FRATERNITY OF VACABONDES

The Fraternaty of Vacabondes, printed by John Awdeley, is well known as the prototype of the literature of roguery which reached its zenith in the pamphlets of Greene and Dekker. When, in 1869, Viles and Furnivall reprinted this treatise for the Early English Text Society, the work was thus described on the title page "By John Awdeley. (Licensed in 1560-1, Imprinted Then, and in

1565)."¹ These assertions, that the book was first printed in 1561 and that Awdeley, its printer, was also its author, have ever since been accepted as facts. An examination of the basis for the assertions, however, leaves one with at least the feeling that the Scottish verdict of "Not proved" should be rendered.

First, as to date. The earliest extant edition of *The Fraternity* is dated 1565; of this edition all that survives is a single leaf—a title page—in the possession of the Bodleian. A second edition was published in 1575, and of this edition also the Bodleian possesses the only extant copy. So far as I know, Dibdin was the first bibliographer to describe the variant editions of this work. He records among works printed by Awdeley a copy dated 1565, and adds "Again without date. See p. *post.*"² A few pages on, in his list of undated books printed by Awdeley, he records another edition, dated 1575 according to his own account.³ Either Dibdin added the date conjecturally, or he erred in including this edition among Awdeley's undated productions. In any case, the title page and foliation correspond exactly to the edition of 1575.

Some time later, J. P. Collier chanced upon the entry in the Stationers' Register to Awdeley in 1560-1 of a "ballett called the Descriptions of Vakabondes."⁴ Accordingly he tossed off the following note:

This entry seems to refer to an early edition of a very curious work printed by Sampson, alias Awdeley,⁵ in 1565, when it bore the following title [he transcribes the very long title]. The edition without date mentioned by Dibdin (IV, 564) may have been to that entry—If this work came out originally in 1561, according to the entry, there is no doubt that it was the precursor of a very singular series of tracts on the same subject.

It will be noticed that Collier's suggestion as to an edition of 1561 is based upon the fact that in that year Awdeley was licensed to print a "ballett" dealing with vagabonds. Now, in the absence of direct evidence to the contrary, it is reasonable to assume that this

¹ *BETS*, extra series, no IX (1869).

² Thomas F. Dibdin, *Typographical Antiquities* (London, 1810-19), IV, 564.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 569.

⁴ J. P. Collier, *Extracts from the Registers of the Stationers' Company* (London, 1848-9), I, 42.

⁵ Awdeley is variously referred to in the registers as John Awdeley, John Sampson, and Sampson Awdeley. His occasional assumption of the alias Sampson has never been explained.

entry in the Registers does actually allude to a ballad now lost and not to the prose work which survives.⁶ It is possible, of course, as Furnivall suggested, that the clerk who recorded the payment erred, perhaps because of the metrical address of the printer to the reader which was printed on the verso of the title page and which possibly stood at the head of the MS as prepared for the licenser. On the other hand, there is no evidence that this was the case, and in 1561 Awdeley was printing many broadside ballads, and in this case paid the fee of 4 d customary for a ballad.

When Viles and Furnivall came to edit the *Fraternity* along with other tracts of the same type, they were eager to prove what needed no proof—that the *Fraternity* was the immediate inspiration of Harman's *A Caveat or Warening for Commen Cursetors*. Harman himself, as Furnivall pointed out, speaks of having seen "a few yeares since a small breife setforth of some zelous man to his countrey,—of whom I know not" dealing with the same subject as the *Caveat*, and the reference is unquestionably to the *Fraternity*.⁷ But Furnivall, who wrote the introduction, was troubled by the phrase "a few yeares since", accordingly he assumed as fact Collier's conjecture as to an edition of 1561. As a matter of fact, the earliest edition of the *Caveat* appeared in 1567, it was entered in the Register under the date 1566-7. In 1567 Harman might perfectly well observe that he had seen the *Fraternity* a few years since with reference to the edition of 1565.

It would appear, therefore, that the evidence for an edition of 1561 is at best inconclusive. Other students, however, have been less skeptical than I. W. C. Hazlitt describes the edition of 1565 and adds flatly, "licensed to Awdeley, 1560-1."⁸ Sir Sidney Lee, writing of Awdeley in *DNB*, asserts that the *Fraternity* "was licensed about July 1561 and published by himself in 1565.—It was reprinted [*italics mine*] in 1565 and 1575—" The *Cambridge History* lists the ballad, with the note, "Now lost, unless it was an

⁶ It is of interest to note that Professor Hyder Rollins accepts this entry as referring to a ballad without question. See his *Analytic Index to the Ballad-Entries in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London* (Chapel Hill, 1924), p. 54.

⁷ See the dedicatory epistle to the Countess of Shrewsbury. Viles and Furnivall, *op cit*, p. 20.

⁸ *Handbook to the Popular, Poetical, and Dramatic Literature of Great Britain* (London, 1867), p. 18.

earlier edition of the *Fraternitie*." But the effect of this restrained comment is counteracted by the description of the *Fraternitie* itself "Printed 1561. Rept. 1565, 1575"⁹ Turning to the *Short-Title Catalogue*, one is relieved to find no mention of an edition of 1561 in the list of Awdeley's works. But alas, under the Harman entries the 1575 edition of the *Fraternitie* is described as an edition of the *Caveat* and the entry of 1561 in the Stationers' Register is faithfully recorded. So is confusion worse confounded.

Concerning Awdeley's authorship of the work I also feel some uncertainty. No author's name appears on the title page. The only evidence is to be found in the verses addressed by the printer to the reader. Briefly, these verses tell that a certain vagabond, haled before the Sessions, consented to reveal the mysteries of the brotherhood upon condition that his anonymity be preserved and himself thus protected from the vengeance of his companions. The concluding stanza reads

They graunting him this his request,
He dyd declare as here is read,
Both names and states of most and least
Of this their Vacabondes brotherhood,
Which at the request of a worshipful man
I have set forth as well as I can

The whole tone of the verses is that of a pleasant fiction designed to establish the authenticity of the treatise which follows. Does the last line quoted above mean that Awdeley was the author? I submit, not necessarily. "Set forth" may mean "written", but it may mean merely "printed." Such addresses from printer to reader were by no means uncommon. To be sure, Awdeley seems to have been the author of several ballads, but his name is attached proudly to these productions. Certainly Harman, Awdeley's contemporary, did not attribute the *Fraternitie* to him, indeed, he specifically states that he did not know the name of the author of the "small breife" on vagabonds which he had seen.

In what I have written above I by no means intend to deny flatly that Awdeley was the author of *The Fraternitie of Vacabondes*. I do contend, however, that his authorship is almost as doubtful as is the assumption of a 1561 edition of the book. Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges seems to have been the first to suggest Awdeley

⁹ *CHEL*, III, 492.

as the author.¹⁰ Collier repeated the suggestion and Furnivall, with the voice of authority, confirmed it. The *DNB*, the *Cambridge History* and the *Short-Title Catalogue* all follow, with never so much as a query as to authorship.

ALLAN G. CHESTER

The University of Pennsylvania

NOTE ON DEKKER'S *OLD FORTUNATUS*

A study of the time and events involved in Thomas Dekker's rewriting of *The Pleasant Comedy of Old Fortunatus*¹ until the publication of the play gives rise to interesting speculations.

Dekker received his first advance of forty shillings for work on *Fortunatus* from Henslowe on November 9, 1599.² Presumably Dekker continued work on the play until November 24, for on that date he was advanced three pounds.³ The play was finished on or before November 30, for on that date Dekker received "in full payment" twenty shillings.⁴ At this point the play must have been ready for the public stage, but it could not have been performed many times, and possibly not at all, because on the next day, "November 31," Dekker was commissioned to alter *Fortunatus* and was paid twenty shillings.⁵ The altering could scarcely have been mere repair work because Dekker had been paid in full for the play, and Henslowe was not a man to pay one pound for "retouching" poor workmanship. This altering may have been a part of the work on the play to make it acceptable for a court performance, and the work went on until December 12, when Dekker was paid forty shillings "for the eande of fortewnatus for the corte."⁶

From the foregoing we may see that *Fortunatus* was not played many times, if at all, on the public stage before the alterations were made for the court performance. Performance while the alterations

¹⁰ *The British Bibliographer* (London, 1810-14), II, 13

¹ Henslowe recorded several performances of a *Fortunatus* in the winter of 1596, see W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, I, 28. With the authorship of the original or with the problem of whether there were one or two parts, we are not here concerned.

² W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, I, 114

³ *Ibid.*, I, 114

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 115

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 115

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 116

were under way, December 1 to 12, was unlikely, for Dekker must have been working with the script, and enough time had not lapsed to warrant the hypothesis of a second copy. Performance on the public stage between December 12 and 27, when the play was given at court,⁷ seems even more doubtful, since, after altering, the play was nearly 3,000 lines long, and this was too long for performance in the London theatres.⁸ For the same reason, it is highly unlikely that the play was staged in the theatre after the court performance. Notoriety attendant upon the performance at court may have led to the printing of *Fortunatus*, for it was registered for printing on February 20,⁹ and the title page of the text bears the date 1600.

The deduction from all the data would seem to be that Dekker was set to work revising or rewriting the old 1596 *Fortunatus* with the hope that the old romantic play could be revived and find favor with London audiences. The hope was not justified by experimental staging, or it was recognized as hopeless, because of changed tastes,¹⁰ without an actual staging. Henslowe, to regain some of his investment, may have gambled upon the possibility of a performance at the court (which in the event of the Queen's presence paid ten pounds), or someone in authority may have recognized the play as the type that might please the Queen. No time was lost, for the Christmas season was at hand when the Queen was to be entertained, and success for the court performance was made certain by having Dekker immediately revise the whole play with a performance before Queen Elizabeth in mind. The Vice-Virtue subplot, the *Prologue for the Court*, and the *Epilogue* were the results of the alteration. These show deliberate appeal to the Queen and virtually insured success at the Court, but the play was outmoded for the London theatre audience, and so it was relegated to the printshop.

W. L. HALSTEAD

University of Miami, Florida

⁷ See E. K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, III, 291.

⁸ See Alfred Hart, "Acting Versions of Elizabethan Plays," *R&S*, x (1934), 1-2.

⁹ Edward Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, III, 156.

¹⁰ R. B. Sharpe, *The Real War of the Theaters*, p. 48, has pointed out that the theatre-goers' taste in plays changed about 1600-1601 and that the old-fashioned, romantic play was in disfavor.

MILTON AS PROOF READER

In his book *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries*, Mr Percy Simpson quotes and amplifies Miss Helen Darbishire's statement concerning the closeness of the manuscript and first edition of *Paradise Lost* to Milton's wishes

In an exhaustive examination of Milton's language, spelling, and punctuation, Miss Darbishire proves that the corrected manuscript was followed closely by the printer and that the text was further corrected in proof under Milton's direction 'The printed page of the first edition is nearer than the manuscript to what Milton would have written if he could' For a blind poet to have secured such exactness is an astonishing achievement¹

And again ·

Even when the work [the manuscript with its corrections] is finished, he bestows the same unerring vigilance, the same passion for perfection, upon the form in which it is to be given to the world He tasked himself, and he must have tasked his copyists and his printer, to ensure these final touches of correctness He was as scrupulous, as methodical, and as persistent as Pope in such points²

A study of the evidence suggests that these statements would bear qualification The manuscript of *Paradise Lost*, Book I, was gone over very carefully several times, and many changes or corrections were made. There are over 200 of these, and Miss Darbishire believes that all except two or three were made at Milton's direction.³ Mr. Simpson seems to imply that all these corrections were followed closely by the printer and that in some places Milton revised the proof still further. There is evidence that Milton *did* make some revisions during the proof stage But the truth is that the printer did not follow the manuscript very closely in spelling and punctuation, and that Milton did not go over the proofs with anything like the care with which he supervised the corrections of the 'fair copy.'

What evidence is given by Miss Darbishire that 'the printed page of the first edition is nearer than the manuscript to what

¹ Simpson, *op cit* (London, 1935), p 95 The quotation from Miss Darbishire is from her valuable work *The Manuscript of Milton's Paradise Lost, Book I* (Oxford, 1931), p xxiii, where the context tends to qualify this statement

² Simpson, *op cit*, p 96

³ Darbishire, *op cit*, p xxiii

Milton would have written if he could ' ? She establishes what she considers to be Miltonic preferences, using three categories words, spelling, and punctuation. Of the hundreds of variations between the corrected manuscript and the first edition, she cites 149 specific cases. Among these are 7 word variations, of which she believes Milton preferred 3 (word changes in proof) as they appear in the first edition, and 4 as they appear in the manuscript, 115 spelling variations, of which she believes Milton preferred 40 as they appear in the first edition, and 75 as they appear in the manuscript, and 27 variations in punctuation, of which she believes Milton preferred 2 as they appear in the first edition, and 25 as they appear in the manuscript. In summary, then, Miss Darbishire thinks that 104 of the variations have better authority in the manuscript than in the first edition, and that in only 45 cases is the first edition nearer than the manuscript to what Milton would have written if he could. So much for specific cases. If, in the other variations, the printer, as Miss Darbishire suggests, perhaps "acted under a general sanction from Milton,"⁴ such a statement does not argue for Milton's unerring vigilance and scrupulous supervision of the first edition, but rather for his indifference in these matters.

As a matter of fact, it was the regular practice of printers in the seventeenth century to use their own standards in spelling and punctuation.⁵ Hence, the natural assumption would be that, except for a few changes in proof, Milton's carefully revised manuscript was closer to his wishes than the first edition, and this, it seems to me, is what the specific cases cited by Miss Darbishire prove.

Ann Arbor, Michigan

DONALD G. STILLMAN

NOTES ON AMBROSE PHILIPS

The most recent study of the life of Philips, Miss Segar's biographical introduction to her edition of *The Poems of Ambrose Philips*,¹ while it collects and uncovers much information which

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. xxvi

⁵ See Joseph Moxon, *Mechanic Exercises* (1683), II, 198, cited twice on this point by Mr. Simpson *op cit.*, pp. 53 and 112.

¹ Percy Reprints XIV, Oxford, 1937

before lay scattered and unknown, contains two minor errors and has one important omission

The omission concerns Philips's activities during the years after the Whigs had returned to power and before he went finally to seek his fortune in Ireland in the train of Hugh Boulter, Archbishop of Armagh. Philips, as a Whig supporter and one who had a claim to patronage from the party in power, has always appeared as one disappointed by Addison of his expectations

The late Paul Whitehead relates that, when Mr Addison was Secretary of State, Philips applied to him for some preferment, but was coolly answered, that it was thought that he was provided for by being made a justice for Westminster To this our author, with some indignation replied, "Though poetry was a trade he could not live by, yet he scorned to owe subsistence to another which he ought not to live by"²

In reality, Addison provided well for Philips When Addison became Secretary of State, he left the Commission of Trade and Plantations, of which he had been a member for some time Shortly thereafter, Philips commenced to appear before the Commission as Agent for New York. There can be little doubt that this post, entailing few duties, was obtained for Philips by Addison, since, according to the records, Philips had no real qualifications for his position. He had never been to New York and knew nothing of so elementary an affair as the boundaries claimed by the colony. Philips held the post for a short time after Addison's death, but was not strongly enough entrenched to hold on when a man who knew something about New York appeared.

The following evidence of Philips' activities as agent for New York is from the *Journal of the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations*.³ The first mentioned communication from Philips to the Board is a Memorial, dated 26 November 1717 In the entries for the next day is a reference to Mr. Philips's letter of 4 July 1717. On 11 and 12 February 1717/18 the Journal records letters from Philips relative to complaints made against Brigadier Hunter, Gov-

² *Biographia Dramatica*, I, 11, 570 This entry seems to be the source of the note in Bohn edition of Addison, London 1854-56, v, 429, as referred to by Miss Segar, *Poems*, p. xl

³ *Journal of the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations*, March 1714/5 to October 1718 London H M Stationery Office, 1924, also *Journal of the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations*, November 1718 to December 1722

ernor of the Provinces of New Jersey and New York An extract of the letter was sent to Mr. Attorney General and a copy to Mr. Secretary Addison. On 19 February 1717/18 the Board received a Memorial from Mr. Philips "in favour of an Act passed there in 1715, for a general naturalization" On 26 August 1718,

the Secretary acquainted their Lordships, that he had disposed of the Commissions under the Great Seal of Great Britain for pardoning of Pirates, mentioned in the Minutes of the 21st instant, as follows, vizt —

The Commissions for New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania,
and Connecticut—To Mr Ambrose Philips, Agent

Other commissions were disposed of to other agents It may be remarked that Philips seems to have received more than his fair share of what appears to be a profitable perquisite, his friendship with Mr Secretary Addison was apparently bearing more fruits.

Philips, according to the *Journal*, did not again communicate with the Board until 1 October 1718. Then and on 10 February 1718/19 he had only routine business to write about The next entry, under the date of 24 April 1719, was doubtless of far more importance to him. Acts passed at New York in July and October, 1718, were read to the Board. Number 12 among them was "An Act to enable the Treasurer of this Colony to remit Ambrose Philips, Esqr., the sum of 187½ ounces of Plate." It was "agreed to let the . . . Acts aforesaid lye by probationary." A more important matter for the colony was brewing, that it was of less importance to Philips seems evident. On 22 July 1719, the Board summoned Mr Philips and other agents to appear upon matters relative to the French boundaries. On 24 July 1719

Mr Philips, Mr Gee and Capt Hyde attending, their Lordships asked them whether they could give a particular account of what had been esteemed the ancient boundaries between the British Settlements and those of the French in North America, and whether the French have made any incroachments or seizures upon us, and in that case, what were our losses Mr Philips, Agent for New York, said that having never been in that province, nor received any information in relation to the boundaries thereof, he could not give their Lordships any satisfaction at present, but that he would speak to Col Vetch, who he believed knew more than any other in this Kingdom, and bring their Lordships the best account he was able to get.

The other agents were better informed about the colonies they represented. It took Philips some time to secure the information required, for it is not until 4 August that the *Journal* records "A

letter from Mr. Philips, Agent for the Province of New York, inclosing a letter from Col. Vetch, relating to the boundaries of that province was read." One final mention of Philips occurs in the *Journal* after a silence of four months. On 5 December 1719, a letter from Brigadier Hunter and one from Philips were read. The business on hand was the appointment of a Councillor in New York.

There is no reason given for Philips's ceasing to serve as agent for New York, but one need not look too far for one. Addison had died, and a man who knew something about the province of New York had arrived in London. Brigadier Hunter, the Governor of New York about whom Philips had been transmitting complaints to the Commission as early as 11 and 12 February 1717/18, attended the meeting of the Board on 22 December 1719. From then until his appointment as Governor of Jamaica in 1727, he continued to transact the business of the colony of New York before the Board. He may have been given the post as agent to compensate for his removal from the governorship, or there may have been other reasons, but there is no reason to doubt that he was a better agent than Philips had been. Hunter appeared regularly before the Board and certainly may be assumed to have known more about the colony of New York than Philips.

The first of the minor errors in Miss Segar's introduction is in the dating of a letter of Addison.⁴ She quite properly points out that the conjectural date assigned to it in the Bohn edition, 10 March 1710, is incorrect, since the letter states clearly that Mr. Dennis' tragedy is in its first run of acting. Miss Segar's reference to the *DNB* as authority for the date of Dennis' *Liberty Asserted* as 1704 has misled her, since Genest⁵ makes clear that the tragedy was acted first at Lincoln's Inn Fields on 24 February 1703/04. Her dating of the letter as of 10 March 1705 is a year wrong, since by that time Dennis' tragedy had been gone from the stage a year. The statement that Philips went to Italy to be tutor to Simon Harcourt, son of the Lord Chancellor, in 1710/11 is also incorrect.⁶ Miss Segar apparently bases her date upon a letter of 30 June 1711 from William Stratford to Edward Harley which asserts that Har-

⁴ *Poems*, p. xx.

⁵ Genest, *History of the Drama and Stage in England from 1660 1830* Bath, 1832, II, 306.

⁶ *Poems*, p. xxxiii.

court was enraged against Philips as the source of stories that Harcourt had, while traveling on the Continent, spoken carelessly, committing both himself and his father to the interests of "a young person abroad" Sir Simon is rumored to have denied his Jacobitism and to have bought silence of Philips, who had been in charge of young Harcourt on his travels after an earlier tutor, a Mr. Forrester, had left Harcourt "in some place in Italy."⁷ There is, however, nothing in this letter to indicate with certainty that these events are all of the past winter. Actually Harcourt had been elected member for Wallingford in 1710,⁸ and was not absent from town long enough between the middle of February, 1710/11 and June 1711 for the trip to Italy to have taken place.⁹ The probable date of Philips's acting as bear-leader to young Harcourt is the winter of 1707-08. Philips, as Miss Segar has established, was taken prisoner at the Battle of Almanza in Spain in April 1707.¹⁰ By October, again according to Miss Segar's research, he had been exchanged, and he received payment of a stipend from St. John's College, Cambridge, in December 1707.¹¹ In the light of other evidence, this can hardly be accepted as conclusive proof that Philips was in England and received the stipend personally in December 1707. The various references in Swift's letters to a love affair of Philips in Geneva and the later attempts of Philips to get a post at Geneva, as well as the statement of Miss Segar (upon evidence which I have not been able to examine) that "There is reason to suppose that Philips may have passed through Geneva on his way to England after the Battle of Almanza,"¹² should not be passed over lightly. We know that Harcourt was in Rome in December 1707. He is mentioned in a letter of James Gibbs, the architect

⁷ *Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports*, Portland, VII, 37. This letter is quoted by Miss Segar, pp. xxxiii-iv, with certain omissions, some indicated and some not.

⁸ *DNB*. See also *Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports*, Portland, VII, 14.

⁹ Harcourt's presence in England is proved by fairly regular mention of him in the *Journal of the House of Commons*, XVI, under date of 29 November 1710; 8, 12, 19, 24 and 28 February 1710/11, 12 and 16 March 1710/11, 4, 17, and 26 April 1711. Mr. Harcourt is never among those listed as receiving permission to be absent from the House of Commons for a short time. Reference to Swift's *Journal to Stella* will also show that Swift was in young Harcourt's company several times during the period in question.

¹⁰ *Poems*, p. xxiii.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, xxiv.

¹² *Ibid.*, xxvii.

of the Church of St. Mary-le-Strand, to Sir John Perceval as one of nine gentlemen, two of whom are listed as having a 'governor' and 'tutor' in attendance¹³ It seems probable that this may have been a short period during which Harcourt was unaccompanied by a tutor, Forrester having left and Philips not yet arrived Since, also, there is no other time in this period of Philips's life into which this tour with Harcourt can be fitted, we are justified in assuming that it took place sometime during the winter of 1707-08.

S F. FOGLE

The University of Illinois

THE BEGINNING OF POPE'S FRIENDSHIP WITH SPENCE

Soon after the publication, in June 1726, of the first part of Joseph Spence's *Essay on Pope's Odyssey*, there began an acquaintance between the poet and his critic which ripened into one of the most memorable friendships of Pope's life That this acquaintance commenced well before August 1727 is proved by the existence of Spence's manuscript copy of Part II of the *Essay*, which appeared in that month, containing comments and suggested alterations by Pope¹ It was early reported that the poet, pleased with the *Essay*,² sought the acquaintance of the author and thus began their friendship, a story which was accepted by both Samuel Johnson and Joseph Warton³ John Underhill was of the opinion that the Reverend Christopher Pitt, one of Spence's closest friends and at least a correspondent of Pope, had brought poet and critic

¹³ *Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports*, Egmont, II, 218

¹ A detailed description of this manuscript by S W Singer, editor of Spence's *Anecdotes* (1820), appeared in *Notes and Queries*, First Series, I (1849), 396-7 Sold among Singer's papers at Sotheby's on 3 August 1858 (Lot 191), it passed into the possession of the Duke of Newcastle, and at the sale of the Clumber Library at Sotheby's (16 February 1938, Lot 1308) it became the property of James M Osborn, Esq, of Yale University

² Pope wrote to Broome on 4 June 1726 "There is a book lately published at Oxford, called an *Essay on Pope's Odyssey*, which you will have reason to be pleased with" (Elwin-Courthope edition of Pope, VIII, 119).

³ Johnson, *Lives of the Poets*, ed Hill (1905), III, 142 Warton, *Works of Pope* (1797), I, xxxv

together, but Underhill overlooked a letter from Spence to Pitt, dated at New College 12 November 1728, in which Spence writes,

Before this I gave you Mr Pope's real sentiment on your first book, I dare say it was his real sentiment, because, as I told you, I took care to ask him the question *before I mentioned my being acquainted with you*, and it was literally what I told you ⁴

The most authoritative statement on the matter would of course be one from Spence himself—and fortunately we possess just that. Apparently when Warburton was collecting materials for his edition and contemplated biography of Pope, Spence delivered to him extracts from the *Anecdotes*,⁵ and appended the following note:

I dont know whether it may be worth while to mention that Mr Pope's friendship for me, (w^{ch} was continu'd, without any the least interruption, for 18 years,) began on my writing a Criticism, against him T'was not perhaps so very ill-natur'd as Criticisms had generally usd to be, but still twas blunt, & rough enough, in many places—This was publish'd, in two parts, the First, in 1726, & the Second, in 1727—After publishing the First, Mr Layng of Baliol Col in Ox^d, was desir'd by Mr Pope to enquire of my Bookseller, (Wilmot,) who was the author of it I did not care to be known, for I did not know w^t twould [manuscript torn]—Mr P in his ans^t [said he?] was sorry he c^d not know [the au-?] thor, because he s^d have been glad [to become?] acquainted with him, [] however, that he desir'd [] thanks to him, tho' unknown [] Before I published the Se-[cond?], I wrote to Mr P, & desir'd [lea?]ve to send the copy to to him, [th?]at I might not say anything [ag?]t him in it, that might be ill-grounded He corrected the Second with so much fairness, that he says on the Margin, Sometimes, "this is a very great Fault" & at others, "This is a mistake, as you will find by considering such or such

⁴ *Works of Pope*, ed Bowles (1806), vii, 414 (the italics are mine) As early as the preceding 2 August Pope knew that Spence and Pitt were acquainted, for on that date he added a postscript to a letter which Spence wrote to Pitt from Twickenham (Elwin-Courthope, x, 130) But no doubt in the letter of 12 November Spence was referring to a conversation which had taken place prior to 2 August—possibly during that same visit at Twickenham

⁵ "Mr Warburton," wrote Spence on 7 April 1744, "thinks of writing Mr Pope's Life, whenever the world may have so great a loss, and I offered to give him any lights I could toward it" (*Anecdotes*, ed Singer, 1820, p. viii). For another and more circumstantial account of Spence's surrender of the field of Pope biography to Warburton, see Warton, *Works of Pope*, iv, 19, n.

a circumstance" There was but one single fault that he desir'd me to drop, in the whole piece, & that was where he had made too free with⁶ the Scripture-Language, in Calling Jupiter "The God of Gods" Over agstst wch he wrote "I sd be obligd to you if you wd drop this, & spare y^r H Servt"—I have y^t Mss, maikt with his own hand, by me⁷

Pope, then, did indeed seek Spence's acquaintance, though when the two first met it is still impossible to say Since Spence "sent" the copy of Part II. of the *Essay* to the poet, and since the latter recorded his comments on the manuscript, Pope probably returned the edited copy without having the opportunity to discuss it face to face with the author Spence's statement that the friendship was continued for eighteen years (and hence was begun in 1726, eighteen years before the death of Pope) may refer only to the correspondence just described rather than to actual association, but the meeting had occurred at latest by the summer of 1728,⁸ and possibly many months earlier.

AUSTIN WRIGHT

Carnegie Institute of Technology

A DOUBTFUL POEM IN THE COLLINS CANON

The ascription of "Song The Sentiments Borrow'd from Shakespear" to William Collins has long been considered doubtful, largely because the poem did not appear in print until 1788, twenty-nine years after the poet's death, and because the ascription has seemed to lack authority. In attempting to determine the authorship, Professor Alan D. McKillop has found (1) that in 1817 William Beloe printed the "Song" as the work of Henry Headley, but (2) that "C-T-O," who first submitted the poem for publication

⁶ Spence substituted the words "made too free with" for the original "misapply'd"

⁷ British Museum, Egerton MSS 1960, pp 15-16 The manuscript from which I quote, incorrectly catalogued as Warburton's, was first properly identified as Spence's by Professor Arthur E Case in an article entitled "Pope, Addison, and the 'Atticus' Lines" in *Modern Philology*, **xxxiii** (1935-6), 187-193 Its presence among Warburton's papers proves that Warburton, ignoring Spence's request, failed to return it

⁸ *Ante*, note 4 In the *Anecdotes* Spence dates his earliest collections from Pope in 1728

(*Gentleman's Mag*, LVIII, 1788, p. 155), attributed the authorship to Collins¹ Professor McKillop did not notice, however, that "C-T-O" is the signature Henry Headley adopted for all his contributions to the *Gentleman's Magazine*² It seems probable that Beloe recalled only Headley's interest in the piece and ascribed it to him on this basis Under any condition, Headley's scholarship and accuracy are generally unimpeachable, and the attribution of the poem to Collins can now rest upon more reliable authority than heretofore.

EARL R. WASSERMAN

The University of Illinois

DEFOE'S USE OF PERSONAL EXPERIENCE IN *COLONEL JACK*

In 1708 Defoe journeyed to Scotland in company with a friend (apparently his brother-in-law Robert Davis). At Coventry, finding his horse lame, Davis hired another to carry him to Scotland. When the hired horse was not returned to England, and the original owner refused terms of payment, Defoe was accused of robbery.¹ The charge was urged hotly in *A Hue and Cry after Daniel De Foe, and His Coventry Beast* (1711).² According to Dottin, an agreement was finally reached, but

This calumny, based upon a half-truth, did De Foe more damage than did all the violent attacks of the high-fliers, in spite of all his efforts to deny the accusation and explain the matter, it was this damaging pamphlet that was a big factor in making him lose caste with his British public³

¹ "A Poem in the Collins Canon," *MLN*, xxxvii (1922), 181, "Bibliographical Note on Collins," *ibid*, xxxviii (1923), 184-5

² Headley's use of these initials was pointed out by his friend and biographer, Henry Kett, see Headley's *Select Beauties of Ancient English Poetry* (London, 1810), I, viii

³ Cf Wilson, *Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel De Foe* (London, 1830), III, 180-181, Wright, *The Life of Daniel Defoe* (London, 1931, p. 152), Dottin, *The Life and Strange and Surprising Adventures of Daniel De Foe* (trans Louise Ragan, New York, 1929), pp. 144-145

² So in Wilson, but the title varies in Wright and in the French and American eds of Dottin I have not seen the original pamphlet

³ Dottin, *op cit*, p. 145.

In Defoe's *Colonel Jack* (1722) one of the longest incidents has to do with another horse which was ridden off to Scotland and eventually restored to its owner in England.⁴ Colonel Jack's associate stole two horses, one for himself and one for Colonel Jack. After they had ridden safely to Edinburgh, the associate disappeared, leaving Colonel Jack in possession of the horse from Puckeridge:

I had for the most part of this time my horse upon my hands to keep, and as horses yield but a sorry price in Scotland, I found no opportunity to make much of him, and, on the other hand, I had a secret resolution, if I had gone back to England, to have restored him to the owner, at Puckeridge, by Ware. And so I should have wronged him of nothing but the use of him for so long a time, but I found an occasion to answer all my designs about the horse to advantage.

There came a man to the stabler—so they call the people at Edinburgh that take in horses to keep—and wanted to know if he could hear of any returned horses for England. My landlord, so we called him, came bluntly to me one day, and asked me if my horse was my own. It was an odd question, as my circumstances stood, and puzzled me at first, and I asked why, and what was the matter. "Because," says he, "if it be a hired horse in England, as is often the case with Englishmen who come to Scotland, I could help you to send it back, and get you something for riding." So he expressed himself.

I was very glad of this occasion, and, in short, took security there of the person for delivering the horse safe and sound, and had 15s. sterling for the riding him. Upon this agreement, I gave order to leave the horse at the Falcon, at Puckeridge, and where I heard, many years after, that he was honestly left, and that the owner had him again, but had nothing for the loan of him.⁵

It seems clear that "the Coventry beast," which caused so much embarrassment when Defoe's companion rode it to Scotland, is the direct prototype of the horse which Colonel Jack's companion stole from "Puckeridge, by Ware."

JOHN ROBERT MOORE

Indiana University

A NOTE ON KETTNER'S BOOK OF THE TABLE

In his discussion of the work of E. S. Dallas, author of *Poetics* and *The Gay Science*, and literary critic for *The Times* during the eighteen fifties and sixties, Hugh Walker remarks that "it is not altogether easy to understand" how Dallas happened also to write *Kettner's Book of the Table*, one of the most learned and humour-

⁴ I, 102-118 (Aitken ed.).

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 118.

ous of English books on cookery.¹ In fact, there has been no published proof that Dallas was the author. The following hitherto unpublished letter, addressed to F. J. Furnivall, gives Dallas' own word for the extent of his responsibility and, incidentally, suggests that the book may be as interesting to linguists as it unquestionably is to gourmands and wanderers of the literary bypaths of the century

Horse Shoe Hotel,
Tottenham Court Road,
20 Jan'y [1878]

Dear Sir,

May I ask your acceptance of the volume which accompanies this—*Kettner's Book of the Table* I am anxious to call your attention to certain works of the Chaucer period which are exceedingly valuable to the student of the English language, which are at present not at all well edited, and which I think would be received with some welcome by the public if re issued by the Early English Text Society You will see what I refer to if you will be good enough to turn to the articles *Galantine* and *Gallimawfry* in the book now sent

Contemporary with the *Forme of Cury* published by Pegge and the other English cookery books published by Warner, there was a French cookery book, *Le Menagier de Paris*, which has been brought to light quite recently under the editorship of Pichon, under whose name it is catalogued in the British Museum² It is curious to see how the French and English works illuminate each other

If you should care to undertake the work I think I can give you some hints which may be useful, and if you will look up the following words in this new book—Cinnamon, Dariole and Robert—you will see some further examples of the light which these old works throw on some very puzzling words

The book herewith forwarded—perhaps I ought to explain—has been written by me Kettner's name is upon it because he has undertaken the responsibility of the practical receipts—a point of some importance as affecting the sale of the work

Yours faithfully,

E S Dallas³

Yale University

FRANCIS X. ROELLINGER

¹ "Critical and Miscellaneous Prose," *Cambridge History of English Literature* (Cambridge, 1916), XIV, 140

² *The Forme of Cury*, ed Samuel Pegge, London, 1780, *Antiquitates Culinarum*, ed Richard Wainer, London, 1791, *Le Menagier de Paris*, ed J F Pichon, Paris, 1846

³ This letter, folded into a copy of *Kettner's Book of the Table* (London, 1877) was found by Mary Morris of Cambridge, England, who very kindly sent me a transcription of it There is no evidence that Furnivall acted on Dallas' suggestions

A MS. COPY OF WRITINGS BY VOLTAIRE

In the interest of completeness there is a slight supplement to be made to Professor Wade's critical edition of Voltaire's *Épître à Uranie*¹ and to his recent book on French "philosophic" manuscripts of the first half of the XVIIIth century² Since 1866 there has reposed in the Harvard College Library a 120-page manuscript, entirely in the same XVIIIth-century hand, catalogued under the unrecognizable title of *Les Cinquante*³ and containing the following texts 1) *Sermon des cinquante*, by Voltaire; 2) the first 26 lines of *La Moisade* (here spelled Moisiade), the poem that Voltaire and Jean-Baptiste Rousseau were continually attributing to each other, 3) *Épître à Uranie*, 4) *Examen de la religion*, 5) *La Religion naturelle*, by Voltaire.

The manuscript *Sermon* follows fairly closely the text of Moland (xxiv, 438 ff.) the latter shows merely the results of stylistic polishing While there is one long paragraph in the Moland text (p. 451) that is not in the manuscript, the variants are usually like "égorger comme des bêtes" (p. 441) for "égorger comme des dindons" The 26 lines of *La Moisade* show no important variants from the printed text of 1820, the only one I have been able to consult⁴ The variants of this manuscript version of the *Uranie* make it impossible to relate it to any of the texts studied by Professor Wade this "H" text follows 38², A³, AN and L² more often than it does any of the others, and yet in the first 30 lines it shows more than a dozen real variants from all four, in two places there are lines transposed as in no other text. The *Examen de la religion* consists of the first five chapters only of the eleven-chapter group,⁵ as if the copyist had thought the treatise not worth further effort. *La Religion naturelle* shows some differences from the Moland text (ix, 441 ff.). The body of the poem follows Moland with only an occasional variant such as (Pt. iv, 104-5).

¹ PMLA, XLVII, 4 (Dec 1932)

² *The Clandestine Organization and Diffusion of Philosophic Ideas in France from 1700 to 1750*, Princeton University Press, 1938 It is at Mr Wade's generous suggestion that I offer this supplement, in no wise intended as a reflection on his very scholarly studies

³ MS Fr. 17*

⁴ J-B Rousseau, *Oeuvres*, Paris, Lefèvre, 1820, 5 vols; II, 405-407

⁵ Cf Wade, *The Clandestine Organization* . . , p. 141.

La paix enfin, la paix, que l'on trouble et qu'on aime,
Est d'un prix aussi grand que la vérité même (Moland)

La paix enfin, la paix que l'on trouve et qu'on aime,
Est encore préférable à la vérité même (Ms Fr 17*)

But the Exorde, gratuitously addressed in the manuscript to Mme du Châtelet (who was dead when the poem was written), is made up of the 7 lines given as a variant of line 35 (Moland, ix, 461) plus the last 7 lines of the Exorde according to Moland. Then there is a Dédicace which begins:

Tout ce vaste lambris d'azur et de lumière,
Tiré du sein du vuide, et forgé sans matière,
Arrondi sans compas, soutenu sans pivot,
A peine a-t-il coûté la dépense d'un mot

It continues with the first line of the Moland version through the eighth line from the end. This is obviously such a "mauvais manuscrit" as Beuchot mentions in one of his printed copies of the poem.⁶

While this Harvard manuscript was undoubtedly copied after 1750—*La Religion naturelle* was written in 1752—and therefore did not circulate in the first half of the century, nevertheless it includes earlier texts, as do Rouen 1574 and Rouen M. 74,⁷ and may as properly as they be listed among the clandestine treatises of the period. And there may well be in other American libraries and collections other manuscripts of this sort, disguised by the haphazard cataloguing of an incurious age, which would perhaps not add much to our general knowledge of the diffusion of philosophic ideas in XVIIIth-century France but which might further confirm Lanson's suggestion of 1912 and perhaps even clear up some questions of authorship and date.

WM. C. HOLBROOK

Northwestern University

FRAGMENTS FROM THE *FAITS DES ROMAINS*

In addition to the *Quatre Livres des Reis* fragment already described in *MLN*. (LII [1937], 260-62), lot 468 of the Sotheby & Co. sale of July 24, 1935, included five woe-begone bits of vellum torn from two leaves of a central French manuscript of

⁶ Bengesco, *Bibliographie* . . . , i, 187. ⁷ Cf. Wade, *op cit*, pp 307, 308

the fourteenth century I was unable to identify my text until the recent appearance of the Flutre-Sneyders de Vogel edition of the *Faits des Romains* (vol. I, Paris-Groningen, 1937). The correspondences are as follows.—The first piece corresponds on one side to page 684 (lines 30-32) of the edition, and on the other side to 687, 6-8 the second and third, also from the same leaf of the complete manuscript, preserve parts of 684, 34—685, 5, 685, 24-30, 686, 14-21, 687, 10-14 Two larger fragments form contiguous parts of another leaf and correspond to 702, 1-7, 702, 26—703, 1, 703, 18-27, 704, 14-21. Much of the text in these several fragments is effaced beyond legibility.

Further comparison with the edition indicates that each of the two columns of the original manuscript page contained some 42 lines and measured 7.5 centimetres by about 24. The relics which are left correspond very closely to the text of the edition, and deserve mention only as proof of the existence of one more neglected copy of the *Faits des Romains*.

EDWARD B. HAM

Yale University

REVIEWS

Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock. Die deutsche Literatur im Zeitraum des 17. Jahrhunderts. Von PAUL HANKAMER (Epochen der deutschen Literatur, Band II, 2. Teil, Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart, 1935.)

Es ist nicht mehr nötig, das nun schon über zwei Jahre vorliegende und viel besprochene Werk Hankamers im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes anzuzeigen. Seine Vorzüge sind gebührend gewürdigt worden. Es ist reich an anregenden Hinweisen und Betrachtungen, von einem gründlichen Kenner der Epoche geschrieben. Man fühlt sich deshalb bei der Lektüre oft genug zu Dank verpflichtet. Und doch ist dieses Buch eine Enttäuschung. Was nötig war—eine die Forschungsarbeit der letzten Jahrzehnte klarende Darstellung der Literaturgeschichte des 17. Jahrhunderts, das ist von Hankamer nicht geleistet worden.

Das Wesen seines Buches ist durch die Anordnung des Stoffes bestimmt. Es besteht aus zwei Hauptteilen: I. Ursprünge und Bedingungen, II. Formen. Der erste Teil hat fünf Kapitel Raum und Zeit; Soziale Bedingungen; Bildung; Das Religiöse und Sitt-

liche; Das Dichterische. Der zweite Teil ist dreifach gegliedert Die Lyrik; Das Drama; Epische Formen und literarische Prosa — Um mit der Anlage des zweiten Teils anzufangen, so ist für die Darstellung der Literatur eines ganzen Jahrhunderts schon die Systematisierung nach literarischen Gattungen nicht unbedenklich Bis in die Schilderung der Einzelpersonlichkeiten hinein muss Zusammengehöriges auseinandergerissen werden Wiederholungen sind unvermeidlich, besonders in den allgemeineren Ausführungen, vor allem aber das Bild des geschichtlichen Ablaufs muss an Klarheit verlieren Es soll damit gewiss nichts gesagt sein gegen die Notwendigkeit gattungsgeschichtlicher Betrachtungsweise, in Monographien über das Drama usw. Aber das Ziehen der drei Parallellinien musste sich auf Zeiträume beschränken, deren innere Einheitlichkeit uns zweifelsfrei deutlich ist. Naumanns Darstellung der Gegenwartsliteratur (in der gleichen Sammlung) durfte die Grenze dieser Möglichkeit schon erreicht haben.

Noch bedenklicher aber ist in Hankamers Buch die Anordnung des Stoffes in den zwei Hauptteilen. Es mag sich empfehlen, vor die Darstellung der Einzelercheinungen eines Jahrhunderts einen allgemein einleitenden Teil zu setzen. Aber kann man mehr bringen als ein grundsatzliches Kapitel und vielleicht eins der historischen Verbindung nach rückwärts? Wenn man die oben gegebenen fünf Kapitelüberschriften in Hankamers erstem Teil betrachtet wie kann man ausführlich — es handelt sich um fast ein Drittel des Buches! — von diesen Themen sprechen, ohne ständig der Darstellung des Einzelnen vorzugreifen? Das bringt mit Notwendigkeit Wiederholungen und ermüdende Hin- und Rückverweisungen mit sich (Sätze wie *“In anderem Zusammenhang wird über diese und ähnliche Erscheinungen noch zu reden sein”*). Da wo andererseits nicht genug auf die konkreten Tatsachen vorgegriffen wird, bekommt die zu lange Einleitung einen fatalen Charakter blasser Andeutungen, wie z. B. im letzten Teil des Abschnitts *“Bildung”* von p. 92 an.

Die Betrachtung der Kapitelüberschriften des ersten Teils führt noch tiefer hinein zu wesentlichen Fehlern des Buches Wie kann man die *“Sozialen Bedingungen”* gesondert von *“Raum und Zeit”* behandeln, wie trennen sich Begriffe wie Bildung — das Sittliche — das Dichterische? Weder der Reihenfolge der Kapitel noch der Verteilung des Stoffes in ihnen liegt klar heraustretende Notwendigkeit zugrunde.¹ Hier zeigt sich eine Unklarheit im Grundsatzlichen, die dem Buch starker noch als der Anlagefehler schadet. Der Wissenschaftsmoder unserer Zeit entsprechend will Hankamer

¹ Hankamer selbst muss noch bei der Ausarbeitung hierin geschwankt haben Im vierten Kapitel *“Das Religiöse und Sittliche”* ist auf p. 110 ein Satz stehen geblieben *“lebenformend ist nur das Moralische, wie wir bei der Darstellung der Bildungsideen noch einmal werden festzustellen haben”* Das Kapitel *“Bildung”* ist dann später das dritte geworden

stets mehr als das Faktische geben, sein Ehrgeiz ist, die Erscheinungen zu deuten. Das Recht zu deuten hat ein Feuergeist wie Gundolf, dessen seherische Kraft unbekannte Tiefen der Dichtung durchleuchtet. Der Denker hat das Recht, dem sich ein klares Weltbild geformt hat, er vermag—richtig oder falsch—die Fülle der Erscheinungen mit festem Maasse zu messen. Was aber nutzen der allgemeinen Erkenntnis die Deutungen des gebildeten Gelehrten, der jede Philosophie lesend kennen gelernt hat, aber von keiner durchdrungen ist. Da wird aus der wissenschaftlichen Arbeit ein bald mehr, bald weniger geistreiches Spiel mit Worten und Begriffen. Bei Hankamer konnte ein kunftiger Doktorand die Bruchstücke wohl aller heute gängigen -ismen buntgemischt zur Erklärung des 17. Jahrhunderts verwendet finden. Ich greife zwei Sätze heraus, von denen jeder entscheidungslos mit mehreren verschiedenen Deutungen spielt.

Dass es über alle Bildung Geist gibt als eine produktive Anteilnahme an geistesgeschichtlichen Vorgängen, Geist, der auch die Abseitigen zum Verkünder seines neuen Gesetzes machen kann, und dass die dichterischen Ursprünge nicht allein aus der sozialen Form, sondern aus einer nicht weiter fasslichen irrational dunklen Lebensmitte kommen, dafür ist Grimmelshausen ein Beweis. Die zeitgenössische Wirkung freilich wird auch bei ihm durch die sozialen Tatsachen bedingt (p. 57).

Standische Gliedform noch einer christlichen Gemeinschaft, hatte das Bürgertum seit den Anfängen der Renaissance eine religiöse Haltung und Gesinnung ausgeprägt, die als neue Frömmigkeit innerlicher Art dem persönlichen Heilsbedürfnis Genüge tun sollte. Die Reformation, wie der junge Luther sie vertrat und wie etwa Dürer sie verstand, war von dieser bürgerlich deutschen Religiosität weitgehend vorbereitet, ohne dass damit die Kirchenspaltung eine geschichtliche Notwendigkeit genannt werden oder Luthers persönliche Schicksalsbedeutung irgendwie in Frage gestellt sein soll" (p. 103).

Es wurde zu weit führen, sich mit den Schiefheiten in Einzelurteilen auseinanderzusetzen, die bei so verschwommener Betrachtungsweise unvermeidlich sind. In buntem Durcheinander werden Begriffe zur Erklärung verwendet wie "naturgesetzlich," "eine suchtige Zeit," "das geheime Gesetz der geistigen Wahlverwandtschaft," "eine west- und süddeutsche Entscheidung," vor die Opitz "persönlich schicksallos aus einer schicksallosen Landschaft kommend" tritt, oder der Rhythmus der Zeit "gliedert die Vielfalt der literarischen Stile." Auch "rassische Eigenart" muss natürlich bei Gelegenheit helfen, oder eine "nationale Idee," "Genius Deutschlands," "Kräfte und Mächte des deutschen Geistes und der deutschen Seele."

Hankamers Schwäche für vieldeutig nichtssagenden Tiefsinn führt auf der anderen Seite dazu, dass er auf die Tatsachen des realen Lebens geringeren Wert legt. Der grosse Schicksalskrieg des 17. Jahrhunderts ist zu einer Art Hintergrundkulisse geworden, freilich oft erwähnt, aber ohne dass versucht wird, bei einzelnen Personen oder Landschaften die Einwirkung der jeweiligen Zeit-

verhältnisse klar herauszustellen. Bekanntlich war aber dieser Krieg in verschiedenen Teilen Deutschlands und zu verschiedenen Zeiten sehr ungleich in seinen Wirkungen, sodass ein genaues geschichtliches Bild für jede Einzelercheinung unentbehrlich ist.²

In ähnlicher Weise widerstrebt Hankamers ins Allgemeine schweifender Geist einer genauen Betrachtung der materiellen Verhältnisse des Alltags. So wird die Wandlung des bürgerlichen Akademikers vom Humanisten zum Hofmann als ein geistig bedingter Entwicklungsvorgang geschildert. Der bürgerliche Barockdichter sei einseitig und grotesk, schauspielerisch extrem in der hofischen Gebärde, weil die hofische Welt ihm wesentlich fremd geblieben sei. Daraus erkaht Hankamer z. B., dass der Protestant Opitz Streitschriften im Dienste der Gegenreformation schreiben konnte. "*Man bleibt im Grunde der gesellschaftslose Individualist, die gewissenhaft einsame Persönlichkeit, der kein Recht und keine Ublichkeit 'der grossen Welt' Genuge tut*" (p. 50). Zwar wird eingangs erwähnt, dass der spathumanistische Akademiker "durch die sozialpolitische Entwicklung langsam aus der Vereinsamung herausgeführt" wurde, aber wieder bleibt dies nur ein Spielen mit einer Deutungsmöglichkeit. Die robusten Tatsachen des Verfalls der Geldwahrung, der verminderten Existenzmöglichkeiten in den Städten, die den Intellektuellen in den Dienst der Landesfürsten trieben, sind in ihrer Bedeutung nicht gesehen. Indem Hankamer im hofischen Dichter nur den geistigen Nachfolger des Humanisten sieht, verliert er aus dem Auge, welche Bettelexistenz der Dichter in der neu sich bildenden Hofgesellschaft oft, wenn auch nicht immer hatte. Diese materiellen Existenzbedingungen müssen zweifellos in der Deutung der einzelnen Dichterpersönlichkeiten des Barocks und ihrer Werke eine nicht geringe Rolle spielen.—Überall wo Hankamer sich der soziologischen Kategorien bedient, von Klassen spricht, wird diese Vernachlässigung der geschichtlichen und ökonomischen Faktoren evident. Ein Beispiel mehr möge genügen. "*Der seit dem 14. Jahrhundert tragende Stand, das Bürgertum, (fand in der Barockzeit) für sich in der zeitmachtigen Form keinen gemassen und möglichen Lebensstil.*" Nichts vom Bankrott des Bürgertums im 16. Jahrhundert, von der daraus folgenden Unterdrückung der Städte durch die Territorialfürsten, den Verwüstungen des Krieges, der Neuordnung durch den Westfälischen Frieden—was war denn in Wirklichkeit das Bürgertum um die Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts, dass es sich hätte umsehen können nach einem literarischen "Lebensstil"!

Die hier angegriffene Unsicherheit in der Deutung der Zeitercheinungen, die schillernde Unbestimmtheit der Maasstabe und

² P. 118 "während die unteren Schichten eine erstaunliche menschliche Rohheit bewahrten, die der immer verantwortlich gemachte Krieg noch verstärken mochte"—ein solcher Satz verrät etwas wie einen instinktiven Widerwillen, die Macht der Zeitverhältnisse anzuerkennen

Erklärungsversuche muss naturgemäss auch den Wert des soliden Teils des Buches beeinträchtigen. Der Leser kann auch dann, wenn es sich um die literarischen Werke selber handelt, die Hankamer so gut kennt, nicht rechtes Zutrauen zu seinen Einschätzungen fassen, so wenn er Opitz' Persönlichkeit und Leistung herabsetzt oder Zesens Bedeutung hoher wertet, als es gewöhnlich geschieht. Eigenartige Phänomene der Barockliteratur, wie das Nebeneinander oder Ineinander von Frommigkeit und Sinnlichkeit, werden in Hankamers Darstellung nicht verständlicher. Er nennt an einer Stelle die Erotik dieser Zeit manisch, an einer anderen spricht er von einer tiefen Beziehung zwischen erotischem Spiel und Heroismus, ein ander Mal wieder vom Dualismus von sittlich gebundener Weltangst und starkem Gebundensein an die naturhafte Sphäre, dieser bleibe unversöhnt, und so werde "*neben einer idealistischen Sittlichkeitslehre als Fiktion oder gar unter ihrem Schutz eine sexuelle Orgie literaturmöglich, in der dieser abgespaltene Naturbereich in grellen Phantasieen sein Daseinsrecht geltend macht*" (p. 106). Man konnte hier von einer Orgie von Worten und Bildern sprechen, aber was geben sie eigentlich zur Erklärung der Erscheinung?

Die Einwände, die gegen Hankamers Buch erhoben werden müssen, treffen bekanntlich einen nicht geringen Teil der modernen Barockforschung, (und dies mag als Entschuldigung dienen, wenn hier mit dem Buch eines verdienstvollen Gelehrten ohne Schonung umgegangen wird). In ihren Anfängen zu weit schiessend in gestrichelten "Wesens"formulierungen, ist sie in grosseren Werken, Dissertationen und Artikeln fortgesetzt worden, in denen es manchmal scheint, als wollte einer den anderen in eigenwilligen, "barocken" Deutungen übertreffen. Es scheint, als sei der Schaden nicht wieder gut zu machen, dass diese Epoche von der Wissenschaft erst entdeckt wurde, als sie den Positivismus für überwunden erklärte und sich zu philosophischer Betrachtung gereift fühlte. Aber wie kann man mit Nutzen philosophieren, wenn in der Kenntnis der Tatbestände noch so viel aufzubauen ist? Hat man nicht nachgerade den Eindruck, dass Begriffe wie "Zeitalter der hofischen Kunst" immer noch den Fortschritt in der tatsächlichen Erkenntnis jener Epoche verhindern? Indem alles was einem solchen Begriff sich nicht fugt, in den Hintergrund gedrängt wurde, um die vermeintlichen Wesenszüge klarer herauszustellen, ist das Bild der Literatur des 17. Jahrhunderts schief und verzerrt geworden. Sollte vielleicht von der wenn auch geschwacht fortlebenden bürgerlichen Literatur des 16. Jahrhunderts die Linie viel direkter zum Wiederaufleben am Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts führen, sodass Erscheinungen wie der Königsberger und der Nürnberger Kreis, auch Grimmelshausen mehr noch als üblich anders zu messen waren, als nach ihrem Verhältnis zur hofischen Zeitmode?

Jedenfalls, wenn man sich durch Hankamers Buch hindurchgearbeitet hat, fühlt man nur noch dringender das Bedürfnis, dass

die Literaturgeschichte dieser Zeit nun nach zwanzigjähriger neuer Forschung einmal in guter alter Solidität geschrieben werden mochte ohne Zusammenfassung als verwandt gedeuteter Erscheinungen über den ganzen Zeitraum weg, einfach als ein nüchterner chronologischer Bericht über das was da war, was man weiss und was man nicht weiss, wie es z. B. Vietor vorbildlich für Gryphius in seinen "Problemen der Barockliteratur" angefangen hat

Brooklyn College

WM. R. GAEDE

Humanism and Naturalism. A Comparative Study of Ernest Seillière, Irving Babbitt and Paul Elmer More. By FOLKE LEANDER (Goteborgs Hogskolas Årsskrift XLIII) Goteborg: Wettergren & Kerber, 1937. Pp. vi + 227.

American "humanism" has found in the Swedish author of this volume not only a penetrating expositor but also, in the main, an earnest champion. "The historical syntheses" of Paul Elmer More and Irving Babbitt seem to Mr. Leander "entirely correct and also of great significance", and to the justification—and supplementation—of the philosophy underlying these syntheses the greater part of his book is devoted. It includes, incidentally, an effective criticism of the confusions of ideas of some of the contributors to the *Critique of Humanism*. With Babbitt and More the author has bracketed the Baron Seillière, partly because he anticipated them in finding in something variously called "romanticism," "Rousseauism" and "naturism," the *mal du siècle*, partly because his description of the germ of this disorder has something in common with theirs, but chiefly for contrast-effect, for, fundamentally, Seillière's psychopathological diagnosis of the aberrations of modern thought and modern literature and his conception of the remedy are quite unlike those of the humanists, and his philosophy is from their point of view only a somewhat less erroneous variety of "naturism." Since Seillière's "history of naturistic mysticism in sixty volumes" is certainly less known to English readers than the works of More and Babbitt, Mr. Leander's chapters on it have, as a condensation, a certain value independent of their relation to the rest of the volume; and the same may be said of the chapter on the philosophy of Ludwig Klages, though this has apparently been done at second hand, from Seillière's study of that "romantisme intégral" in his *De la déesse Nature à la déesse Vie*. Throughout, the author makes effective use of the comparative method, seeking to bring what is distinctive in the ideas of the humanists into clearer relief by correlating them, by way of both similarity and contrast, with the opinions of other moralists and critics of contemporary tendencies, e. g. John Dewey.

A review of the book in a journal devoted to literary history should doubtless deal chiefly with the question of the validity of those interpretations of individual writers of the past, and the resultant "historical syntheses," which the author accepts. But it is on this exegetical, critical and historical side of the work of Babbitt and More that Mr Leander has least to say; he declares roundly that, to justify his "concurring judgment" on these questions, little "knowledge of the history of literature is required—only a certain sense of what is the central inspiration of the literary products of the last two centuries which everybody has read or should have read, and of the essentials of that modern spirit which meets us in every newspaper, novel, cinema and play" To one who, like the present reviewer, finds "the modern spirit"—supposing the term admissible at all—an extremely confused and complex thing, greatly in need of careful analytical discrimination of its component strains, of their historic origins, and of their effects in literature and in collective movements of thought and feeling, this short and easy way of arriving at a "historical synthesis" is necessarily unconvincing. But it is not in such matters that the author seems chiefly interested. He is most concerned to clarify and support the argument for that view of man's constitution and his chief end which he apparently holds to have been best, if not quite definitively, expressed in our time by the American writers with whom he deals. Though he does somewhat less than justice to the diversity of the ideas at work in the thought of More and Babbitt, he is not wrong in recognizing as its most distinctive element an insistence upon the "primacy" of negative will—the power simply *not* to attend to any concrete objects of interest, any desires, any motives, however potent, however natural to man, and however rational, a will finding its good purely in its own exercise *in vacuo*. From the negativity of this conception and its psychologically violent divorce of volition from motive, both at times, especially in their later writings, sought to escape; both also at times erected this "supernatural" power of complete detachment from "the flux" into the supreme good. In so far as they did so, the result was an essentially otherworldly and anti-intellectualistic ethics and (in More's case) metaphysics, with which Mr Leander is apparently in accord. In its less one-sided expressions, their emphasis upon the "inner check," upon the rôle of restraint and discipline of will in the life or reason, was a salutary corrective of contrary tendencies, and therefore a true service to their age. But it was often the correction of an exaggeration by an exaggeration. To this, no doubt, some of its influence was due, *pour faire école, il faut exagérer*. What are called (the terms are far from precise) "feeling" and "intellect" and "will" are inseparably interwoven in man's normal life, and the remedy for a hypertrophy of one of them does not lie in its suppression in the interest

of an apotheosis of another. But this is not the place for a serious discussion of such philosophical and psychological issues. It remains to add that any who are interested in the humanistic movement, its historic affinities, and the ulterior questions which it suggests, will find much that is worthy of note in Mr. Leander's learned and *gedankenreich* volume.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY

The Johns Hopkins University

El Criticón, por BALTASAR GRACIÁN, edición crítica y comentada por M. Romera-Navarro. Tomo Primero. Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press, published in co-operation with the MLA, 1938. Pp viii + 404.

Professor Romera-Navarro has chosen for long and loving study one of the most difficult and meaty texts in all Spanish literature. It is also the book which comes closest to original thought of anything written in Spain in the seventeenth century. No critical edition of it has ever been made before. *El Criticón* was not once reprinted in the nineteenth century, the two twentieth century editions are mere rough texts. To Romera-Navarro, then, belongs the high honor of being the first to do justice to an admitted masterpiece, hitherto avoided by annotators for its sheer abstruseness. This volume contains only the *Primera Parte*. Volumes II and III, each with its respective *Parte*, are to be issued in successive years. The last will provide indexes for the whole. The entire manuscript is complete and ready now.

In the volume before us the editor presents an introduction, a critical text, and explanatory notes. The *Introducción* is divided into a general section and a particular.¹ The former includes a concise *Vida*, a *Doctrina y crítica*, and two pages on Gracián's style, which is considered to have increased steadily in clarity and naturalness from *El Héroe* (1637) to *El Criticón* (1651). At least, it never became limp. As to the *doctrina*, Romera-Navarro, in a succulent prose not unworthy of the master stylist who is his theme, defends Gracián from the charge of antimoral teaching. "Sagacidad y cautela únicas son las de Gracián. Maquiavelismo, no. . . . Raros serán los preceptos que no correspondan a la perfección moral. Contrarios a la moral, ninguno tiene." Gracián presented "el consejo inspirado en la experiencia del mundo," and it is this which has led hasty readers to see only mundaneness in him, but he follows it up always with "el comentario [inspirado]

¹ The *Introducción* is in large part an exact reproduction of various articles by Romera-Navarro which have already appeared, mostly in the *Hispano Review*.

en la impecable moral."² Gracián continues the tradition of Antonio de Guevara and Quevedo, orthodox but worldly-wise. Fortune, ruler of men's fate, is none other than Providence. Yet it may seem that, the more orthodox Romera-Navarro proves Gracián to be, the less well founded is any claim that he stood intellectually above the level of his century and nation. Gracián attempted to reconcile the pagan philosophy of his favorite books with the doctrine of his Church, it is not surprising that the result has caused schism among his interpreters.

The second prefatory section contains six subdivisions. The first traces the evolution of critical opinion concerning *El Criticón*, despised by some as a mass of pompous commonplaces, esteemed by Schopenhauer and Menéndez y Pelayo. The second, *Influjos literarios*, reduces to exact knowledge the loose guesses which have been current regarding the sources of *El Criticón*. The Bible, Cicero, Seneca, Horace, Ovid, Martial, Persius, Plautus, Sallust, Suetonius, Tacitus, Caesar, Pliny, Malvezzi, Guarini, Botero, Boccalini, are the chief, outside of Spain. The reader may wonder whether, with so many and so weighty tutors, Gracián contributed of his own anything more than brilliant variations on classic themes.

The last four divisions deal with text and bibliography. The text, established with scrupulous fidelity, so far as one who has not access to the originals may judge, is based upon the first and third editions of the *Primera Parte* (Zaragoza 1651, Madrid 1658). And here we meet a strange flaw. The second edition (Lisboa 1656), duly described on p. 61, is left out of account. The list of orthographic variants (pp. 56-59) does not make use of it. The statement "Publicáronse dos ediciones de la Primera Parte de *El Criticón* en vida del autor, la de Zaragoza 1651 y la de Madrid 1658" (p. 53) is manifestly misleading. I am perplexed by this so obvious lapsus, it seems that some good reason must exist for the preterition of the second edition, but none is given to the reader.

The bibliography, descriptively full for each item, is not intended to be complete for all the works of Gracián, it has two sections, one for *El Criticón* and one for *Obras completas*. It makes no mention of two editions listed by Latassa (*Biblioteca nueva de escritores aragoneses*) and others,³ a princeps of the *Primera Parte*, Madrid

² It is appropriate to cite in this connection the words of Raymond Pearl (*To Begin With*, New York and London, 1930, p. 45) "no other book [Gracián's *Oráculo manual*] ever written is so subversive of all the stated principles of Christian ethics, while maintaining itself on the highest of moral planes throughout. Gracián is the transcendent—nay the truly miraculous—university president."

³ Backer-Carayon-Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, III, Bruxelles-Paris, 1892, p. 1650, Antonio Palau y Dulcet, *Manual del librero hispano-americano*, III, Barcelona, 1925, p. 391. It seems likely that these two bibliographers merely copied Latassa blindly, but I have no proof of it.

1650, and a princeps of the *Tercera Parte*, Huesca 1653. The editor may have taken for granted that their existence is to be regarded as unproven, but he should have made a specific statement to that effect.*

It would be useful if the third volume could find space for a complete Gracián bibliography—of his writings and of writings about him.

In the annotations, it seems to me, lies the greatest of the many merits of this edition. There are 1676 notes in the present volume alone, and they often occupy more space on a page than the text. With erudition equal to that of the Jesuit author, Romera-Navarro has traced the sources of proverbs, sentences, phrases, satires, ideas. He has elucidated all the thorniest passages and dodged none. If some still remain obscure, it is because this scintillating and cryptic moralist encounters different blind spots in different readers. The adjective *denso*, rather overworked of late by critics, applies perfectly to Gracián.

When one considers that Romera-Navarro has, single-handed, compiled a corpus of information equal to that built up for the *Quijote* in successive increments over many decades, one must unreservedly applaud his industry and learning. This edition is for him a safe monument against the future.

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY

The University of California

From Latin to Portuguese, Historical Phonology and Morphology of the Portuguese Language. By EDWIN B. WILLIAMS. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938. Pp. xii + 315.

Depuis l'article de Cornu dans le *Grundriss* de Grober nous n'avions pas de grammaire historique du portugais complète et *up to date*. Le "Altportugies. Elementarbuch" de Huber, se conformant aux buts de la collection Winter destinée aux exercices des 'séminaires,' ne donnait en somme que les renseignements nécessaires à l'intelligence des textes inclus dans ce livre (à vrai dire aussi un abrégé de la syntaxe et de la formation des mots). M. Williams, avec la compétence qu'on lui connaît en fait de grammaire historique, a comblé cette lacune. Le livre qu'il nous a donné est un guide sûr et nous oriente sur le fonds de connaissances dont le dernier quart de siècle a enrichi les études portugaises: nous

*The rare *Obras*, *Tomo segundo*, Madrid, 1674 (p. 73) exists in the Biblioteca Nacional as well as at the University of Barcelona, according to Lucas de Torre in *Revue Hispanique*, LXXXI, 1933, II, 87-88.

apprenons p. ex les explications nouvelles que des savants comme MM Gamillscheg et José Maria Rodrigues ont données pour l'infiniflexion, et les résultats des investigations de M Williams lui-même sur la désinence *-ão*, les études de dialectologie, plus poussées, permettent de localiser tel phénomène phonétique ou morphologique. Nous croyons pouvoir mesurer ce qu'il a fallu à l'auteur d'ardeur patiente pour rassembler tous ces renseignements particulièrement éparpillés pour une langue comme le portugais.

A vrai dire, cette grammaire n'est "historique" que dans le sens des œuvres de Schwan-Behrens ou de Grandgent, que je qualifierais plutôt de l'épithète, nullement dénigrante, d' "annalistes". Nulle tentative n'y est faite de grouper les phénomènes de façon à aboutir à une synthèse comme celle qu'a esquissée Meyer-Lubke dans sa classique *Histor Gramm d Franzosischen* (et d'ailleurs seulement dans la partie phonétique) les différentes voyelles et consonnes sont encore traitées séparément, et les inévitables "accidenti generali" d'Ascoli ne manquent pas; la morphologie est un catalogue de formes, parquées dans leurs paragraphes-casiers: une véritable histoire interne du portugais (et même du proto-portugais) devrait distinguer les époques du devenir phonétique et morphologique (peut-être à l'aide de tableaux chronologiques, comme chez Meyer-Lubke) et ramener tous les développements à quelques tendances fondamentales, qui ensuite pourraient être mises en rapport, comme v. Wartburg et Schurr l'ont fait pour le français, Schiaffini pour l'italien et particulièrement Menéndez Pidal dans son livre magistral "Orígenes del español," avec des mouvements de culture. Le maigre paragraphe 21 ne peut pas tenir lieu d'une véritable explication de la genèse du portugais il faudrait voir à l'œuvre une force culturelle, comme chez Menéndez Pidal on la voit dans le castillan, se manifestant sur tous les domaines d'histoire poétique, artistique, littéraire etc et tendant à accentuer l'individualité du groupe. Ce que nous avons dans le livre de M Williams, c'est un manuel commode, clair et de toute confiance, où un registre bien complet nous permet de trouver aisément les faits particuliers qu'on a relevés jusqu'ici dans des textes. Nul essai non plus de caractériser le portugais vis-à-vis des autres langues romanes! Je placerai ici une vue synthétique de mon regretté maître Meyer-Lubke, qu'il a proposée dans un de ses cours (vers 1906), mais qu'il n'a pas, que je sache, publiée. le portugais tend, au contraire de l'espagnol, à garder intact le début du mot (les consonnes initiales sont mieux maintenues qu'en espagnol où *f-*, *g-*, *j-* tombent, les nexus *cl-* *fl-* *pl-* perdent leur premier membre, alors que le port *chamar* etc garde le premier), tandis que la fin du mot est faible (chute des voyelles en portugais, très fortement articulées en espagnol)—le maître s'interdisait une inférence bien séduisante sur les caractères nationaux des peuples respectifs.

Je ne comprends pas pourquoi notre auteur insiste dans sa préface

sur son désir "to maintain a rigid line of demarcation between phonology and morphology and to base the latter rigorously on the former with the intervention of no other factor than analogy"—serait-il vraiment encore partisan du parti-pris "néogrammairien" de 1876, que Schuchardt, Gillieron, Meillet, Vossler ont démasqué depuis longtemps? Y a-t-il vraiment en théorie une ligne de démarcation entre la phonétique et la morphologie et ne voyons-nous pas au contraire toutes les tentatives d'*expliquer* un processus phonétique aboutir à des faits psychologiques, voire "idéalistes" (chez Menéndez Pidal, Schurr etc)? Et si la théorie refuse cette distinction, pourquoi la maintenir dans la pratique? Dans ce même ordre d'idées j'inclurais aussi la demande d'un traitement historique de la sémantique, de la formation des mots et de la syntaxe, disciplines pour lesquelles M. Williams est bien outillé et qu'on a indûment négligées (pas seulement pour le portugais)—la séparation de la phonétique et de la morphologie du reste de la langue conduit vers cette idée fausse que ces deux sont les disciplines "classiques" et seules scientifiques de la linguistique—idée naturellement tout à fait étrangère à M. Williams, qui traite lui-même au paragraphe 14 des changements syntaxiques du latin vulgaire conditionnant des changements morphologiques portugais dont il doit traiter.

Quelques critiques de détail § 16 la théorie sur l'accent latin est simplifiée outre mesure v la dernière édition du Stolz-Schmalz § 33 je n'aime pas beaucoup des étymons comme "*andamium* (Du Cange)," mis là sans astérisque la charte citée par ce dictionnaire s v *andamicus* (sic, la forme du texte est *andamos* acc du plur) date de 1035 et est simplement une latinisation du mot portugais De même pourquoi citer un "*güvram* (Du Cange)" au § 39, alors que Meillet-Ernout discutent ce *gü(l) via*? L'explication de *fome* par l'analogie de *come* 'il mange' me semble un peu mécanique v ce que Schuchardt dit dans "Über die Lautgesetze" de cet exemple crucial d'un représentant *unique* d'une 'loi phonétique' De même, l'explication du fr *soif* d'après *boif* 'je bois' est très problématique § 67 je ne comprends pas encore, après avoir lu le passage sur *pl- > ch-*, les développements parallèles de *cl-, fl- > ch-* § 114 l'étymologie **rotatōrem > redor* me semble impossible j'ai tenté de la remplacer *RFE*, xx, 169 par le comparatif de *retro de *retriorē* [loco]. § 136 les numéraux sont traités d'une façon un peu sommaire (peut-être trop du point de vue "from Latin to Portuguese") on n'y apprend rien sur le système vigésimal, et les numéraux distributifs et multiplicatifs? V mon article "Ürtumliches bei romanschen Zahlwortern," *ZRP*, xlv, 1 seq

LEO SPITZER

L'Exotisme dans la littérature française depuis Chateaubrand. Le Romantisme. Par PIERRE JOURDA. Paris: Boivin & C^{ie}, 1938. Pp. 211. 40 francs.

Aux spécialistes de l'exotisme, le livre de M. Jourda n'apportera que peu de nouveau. Telle n'est point d'ailleurs l'ambition de l'auteur qui, après avoir montré dans une excellente préface qu'il

n'ignorait point l'étendue du domaine qui s'ouvrait devant lui, a préféré se cantonner dans des limites assez étroites. Passant en revue dans des chapitres bien documentés l'Angleterre, les Pays du Nord, l'Allemagne, l'Italie, l'Espagne, la Grèce et l'Islam et enfin la Russie, il a délibérément laissé de côté la Suisse trop proche, l'Algérie encore trop peu connue, les terres trop lointaines des deux Amériques, l'Extrême Orient et la Polynésie. L'exotisme ainsi compris est essentiellement un exotisme civilisé. Il ne contient que peu de ces éléments primitivistes qui forment une partie essentielle de l'exotisme pré-romantique et post-romantique. Si cette constatation est exacte, elle est curieuse, inattendue et de quelque importance, car elle va droit à l'encontre des idées reçues. À s'en tenir à la "synthèse" et aux "sondages" présentés par M. Jourda, il semblerait cependant que l'exotisme des romantiques ait été fort peu philosophique, peu ou point sentimental et psychologique, mais au contraire presque entièrement pittoresque et fort superficiel.

Très justement, M. Jourda constate que "l'initiateur ici c'est Chateaubriand. Il a révélé le monde extérieur, émotion et relief, lumière et couleur . . . il est le premier à construire un paysage, à créer une sorte d'impressionisme où *Les couleurs, les parfums et les sons se répondent*, et de ces descriptions il dégage toujours une émotion" (p. 25). Mais, si rare est cette émotion chez les écrivains qu'étudie M. Jourda, qu'il est forcé de ne mentionner comme continuateurs authentiques de Chateaubriand que "Loti près de Rarahu ou de Djenane, Barrès à Grenade, à Venise ou à Sparte." Pour "pittoresque, amusant, coloré" qu'il puisse être, l'exotisme des Romantiques est bien rarement émouvant. S'il ne nous touche point, ce n'est pas parce qu'il ne présente pas une vision "exacte et objective des pays lointains," mais bien au contraire parce que, malgré toute sa couleur locale d'ailleurs souvent inexacte, il n'est pas empreint de cette mélancolie, de cette nostalgie, de ce désir éperdu de "l'ailleurs" qui font de René le grand ancêtre des écrivains exotiques modernes.

C'est ici que se manifeste le danger principal de la méthode adoptée par M. Jourda. Par romantisme, il entend évidemment non pas un phénomène moral et social, un renouvellement et un bouleversement des valeurs humaines, mais une mode littéraire dont on peut suivre le développement pendant un intervalle de temps exactement mesurable, en l'espèce de Chateaubriand aux environs de 1840. Encore cette date n'est-elle pas très précise, puisque l'on trouve mentionnés dans la bibliographie les *Poèmes barbares* de Leconte de Lisle (1862), le *Voyage en Russie* de Gautier (1867) et même les *Nouvelles Asiatiques* de Gobineau (1876). C'est qu'en fait, M. Jourda a étudié non pas l'exotisme dans la littérature romantique, mais la peinture des pays d'Europe et du proche Orient chez les principaux écrivains-voyageurs de l'époque romantique. Il ne parle en effet que des pays qu'ils ont décrits après les avoir

visités, son but essentiel étant de montrer, "contre George Sand, que les Français du XIX^e siècle ont su voyager" (p. 26). Il a été ainsi conduit à ne pas nommer Baudelaire, qui porta l'exotisme romantique à son point extrême, non plus que le Flaubert des *Œuvres de jeunesse* qui est pétri de romantisme. C'est chez Flaubert, cependant, qu'il aurait pu constater comment, entre 1838 et 1845, l'exotisme romantique se transforma graduellement en cet exotisme "objectif" qui, selon M. Jourda, caractérise les écrivains de la génération suivante. Il aurait pu voir en particulier comment, dans les *Mémoires d'un fou* (1838, éd. Charpentier, p. 91), apparaît déjà cet amour des femmes "de toutes les couleurs" qu'il ne signale chez Gautier que dans une conversation rapportée en 1863 par les Goncourt. Dans *Novembre* (1842, p. 385-389), il aurait trouvé une longue rêverie à travers tous les temps et la vaste terre, la hantise nostalgique de pays jamais vus et le désir suprême de "mourir du choléra à Calcutta ou de la peste à Constantinople". Dans la première *Education sentimentale* (1845, p. 171-180), enfin, il aurait vu Flaubert renoncer aux rêves, "comme un roi qui abdique," pour "disséquer l'organisme compliqué des passions et des idées."

À côté de ce désir passionné d'évasion suivi de ce repliement, l'exotisme littéraire des voyageurs romantiques paraît bien artificiel et bien superficiel. M. Jourda est trop averti pour ne l'avoir pas senti et pour ne pas l'avoir indiqué dans une conclusion très franche et un peu désabusée. S'il avait étendu le champ de son enquête, s'il ne s'était pas borné à l'étude des pays dont les écrivains romantiques avaient une connaissance directe, sa conclusion aurait sans doute été bien différente. Pour ne citer qu'un exemple, l'Italie des *Harmonies* ne donne qu'une bien faible idée du sentiment exotique chez Lamartine. Il faut le chercher, et on le trouvera bien plutôt dans les descriptions du *Voyage en Orient*, mentionné en passant et seulement dans la conclusion, et surtout dans les prodigieuses reconstructions qui doivent fort peu à la réalité qui font de *Jocelyn* et encore plus de la *Chute d'un Ange* des œuvres marquantes dans l'histoire de l'exotisme romantique.

GILBERT CHINARD

Princeton University

Denis Veiras et son Histoire des Sévarambes (1677-1679). By
EMANUEL VON DER MUHLL. Paris: Droz, 1938. Pp. 292.

The real merit of Mr. Von der Muhll's recent work may be judged by comparing it with other treatises on Veiras and his novel. Lanson, Hazard, Lachèvre, and Atkinson have attempted to analyse the rôle of the *Histoire des Sévarambes* in the evolution of French thought. All of them, however, have tended to study it in the

light of eighteenth rather than seventeenth century thought, thereby presenting Veiras as a precursor of the philosophe rather than as a descendant of Descartes. Mr. Von der Muhll has shifted the approach. To him the *Histoire des Sévarambes*, published in 1677-79, belongs to the period of Racine and Boileau in literature, of Louis XIV and Colbert in politics, of the Jansenist-Jesuit controversy in religion, and of post-cartesianism in philosophy. Having placed the work firmly in this period, he has resolutely set forth to study the currents of ideas of the time and to point out the expression of these ideas in Veiras. Thus he has shown Veiras' relationship with the followers of the Paduan School, with the normal libertain current which crystallized in Montaigne and progressed in Lamoignon, le Vayer and Naudé, and with the voluminous voyage literature appearing from the sixteenth century on. Nor is that all. Veiras is revealed to us as a man steeped in the *Bible*, the *Republic*, the *Cyropaedia*, and More's *Utopia*. He was acquainted with revolutionary movements of seventeenth century England as well as the great Spanish conquests of America. With the ideas gleaned from his reading and his own experiences, he constructed a purely rational community in which he himself figures as the hero—Siden the adventurer in Part I, and Sévamas the legislator and conqueror in Part II.

Mr. Von der Muhll has separated and analyzed with care the elements from which Veiras constructed his rational community, classifying them as political, social, and religious-philosophical. And his careful examination of these currents of thought reveals that little therein is original. Veiras' originality consists in the magnificent way in which he put together his rationalized structure and the method whereby he created an abstract civilization and gave it an air of reality. For, as Mr. Von der Muhll has pointed out, the two qualities which arise from this classic utopia are rationalism and realism. The realism, however, is "le vrai-semblable" rather than "le vrai." It is in the realm of possibility rather than in the realm of the actual. And therein resides the explanation of the reception given the book, which in the strictest sense of the term is a fiction. Mr. Von der Muhll has asked himself why, at the peak of classicism, a work of this type should be welcomed by the public and tolerated by the censor, and his answer is surprisingly simple and reasonable. The public and the censor saw nothing "dangerous" or "advanced" in the logical structure. Given the solid structure of society of 1677, the compactness of Louis XIV's government, and the feeling of security in the present and confidence in the future which permeated the psychology of the time, it is readily understandable that no one was disturbed at the discussion of miracles or deistic ideas, or theories of the origin of monarchy, state socialism, and state education expressed in the *Histoire des Sévarambes*. Moreover, these ideas, far from being

new, were really commonplaces in the evolution of seventeenth century rationalism

Mr. Von der Muhll has presented his thesis with lucidity in spite of the amazing amount of detail which he has been forced to control and organize. His biography of Veiras adds but little that is new. His chapter on "Le Troisième Continent," while it contains little that is new, is an exceedingly creditable synthesis of intricate and voluminous material. Chapter three deals with the first part of the novel—the Siden episode. Here Mr. Von der Muhll stresses the realistic framework which this episode contributes to the whole story. The succeeding chapters four, five and six contrast the ideas of the novel with the thought of the time. This task—the establishment and organization of these existing currents of thought—is not an easy one in itself. Fortunately, Mr. Von der Muhll has utilized to the fullest the excellent works of Hazard, Atkinson, Pinot and Busson, to form a background for the ideas of Veiras, and has attempted to evaluate both the idea itself and its position in the evolution of rationalism. Here, there is a slight exaggeration. Mr. Von der Muhll, who has been careful to limit to reasonable proportions the rôle of Veiras in eighteenth century rationalism, is less circumspect when he finds occasion to compare the ideas of Veiras with twentieth century theories of state socialism and communism. This tendentious character of the work leads to a certain confusion in an otherwise excellent presentation. Another confusion arises from Mr. Von der Muhll's desire to list all the possible sources from which an idea might come. These sources being often numerous and diverse, he has become prolix and in a way the victim of Veiras' versatility and ingenuity. It is true, however, that a chapter on the "Sources de L'Histoire des Sévarambes" has in large measure eliminated this defect. Finally, Mr. Von der Muhll, although the most reasonable critic who has dealt with Veiras, is not always free from an exaggeration which springs from enthusiasm. It is hardly exact to state that (p. 194) Veiras is one of the first French deists or that his work (p. 259) is the first and greatest French Utopia. It is less exact, still, to compare (p. 196) Veiras' attitude toward religion with that of Descartes. It is an error to separate (p. 210) Spinoza's *Tractatus* from the "esprit rationaliste de l'époque." As Busson has demonstrated, it was not the least audacious in 1677 to seek the origin of religion (p. 227). And it is at least debatable that the classicists of 1660-1685 were (p. 249) "pour la plupart fort mécontents de la société où ils vivaient." In short, one could pick up a fair number of these debatable points. Their very number, however, attests the extreme interest which Mr. Von der Muhll's thesis offers for those pre-occupied with seventeenth century thought.

IRA WADE

Princeton University

The Spirit of Voltaire By NORMAN L TORREY. New York
Columbia Press, 1938 Pp xiii + 314

The originality of this work lies both in Mr. Torrey's approach to his subject and in his reinterpretation of well-known material. Mr. Torrey has preferred to play, as Pascal said, with the same ball, but he has placed it differently. At a first glance, the reader would be impressed by the book's popular appeal rather than its scholarly research. It is well, however, to be circumspect in passing judgment upon any work of Professor Torrey. It is well, also, to remember that interpretation is as much in the realm of scholarship as historical research.

Mr. Torrey has sought the inner nature of Voltaire in an effort to arrive at a more accurate interpretation of his ideas and beliefs. Obviously this inner nature is revealed by a man's life, works and relationships, a fact which gives rise to some difficulty when Voltaire is concerned. His life is so long and varied, his works are so numerous, his relationships so widespread, that a selection is necessary unless one wishes to rewrite correctly Desnoiresterres's voluminous biography. Professor Torrey has made this selection carefully, preferring in the main to seek the inner nature of Voltaire in his correspondence. Correspondence implies relationships, hence there appear throughout the work little vignettes—Voltaire and Rousseau, Voltaire and Diderot, Voltaire and Mme du Deffand, even Voltaire and Pascal—of which the most charming is Voltaire's discussion of life and death with Mme du Deffand. From these relationships emerges the portrait of the man, and in the man the philosopher. In the portrait as presented, the essential characteristics appear slightly confused. We see in him, however, on closer observation an epicurean attitude toward life, an intense love of justice, a keen desire for friendship at variance with an emotional temperament in which irritability and vanity are salient traits.

Mr. Torrey has further complicated his task in undertaking to defend Voltaire against his detractors. All of us who have worked in Voltaire have experienced irritation at the lack of comprehension on the part of various of his critics. When Brunetière calls him a "triste sire," or, more recently, M. Aubry hints at moral turpitude, we cannot avoid a feeling of annoyance. The part of prudence, however, requires that we do not waste our time defending Voltaire's reputation. Besides consuming an enormous amount of time, we run the risk of purifying our hero to the point of suppressing his human traits. Moreover, it is well to remember that a man who withstood for eighty-four years the attacks of his contemporaries, who has outlasted the criticism of 160 subsequent years and who is still something more than an academic subject of discussion, probably does not need our vindication.

Fortunately, the occasions upon which Mr. Torrey feels that he

must rise in defense of Voltaire are relatively rare and unimportant. Of much more importance are his explanations of certain specific sections of Voltaire's work. Mr. Torrey has been impressed with the theory of the work which looks two ways, and his use of the theory is ingenious, although on one occasion, at least, it has led him to contradict himself (p. 1 and p. 9). He has given a thorough explanation of the enigmatic conclusion of *Candide* by using quotations from other writings of Voltaire. His most important discussion, however, is the chapter entitled "Deist, Mystic, or Humanist?" a chapter which is worth all the rest of the book. He stresses the point that Voltaire's particular type of deism united with "certain mystical tendencies of a cosmic nature" produced a definite humanistic trend in his thought, and he concludes that Voltaire is the greatest humanist of his age.

Mr. Torrey's interpretation is given with a charm and gracefulness which sometimes render its main points elusive. His documentation in Voltaire, however, is so solid that one can rarely quibble with the facts. This is not true of a few general remarks which concern his interpretation of Voltaire only indirectly.

It is at least debatable that it was a Cartesian principle (p. 3, l. 10) that doubt is the beginning of wisdom and perhaps its end. One may question whether "philosophically speaking, [Voltaire] was the greatest and the most complete of the French Classicists (p. 11, l. 20)." It is not entirely clear that the inspiration of *Candide* dates precisely from the Lisbon earthquake (p. 38, l. 11). Nor did Voltaire await the crisis over the Chevalier de la Barre affair to be "whipped into ceaseless activity" (p. 44, l. 15). It is not at all certain that Voltaire's major difficulties for 35 years can be laid at the door of the group surrounding Mme de Tencin (p. 76, l. 15). And to attribute Voltaire's exile of twenty-eight long years to the *Voltaireomanie* and the *Voltaireana* seems slightly exaggerated (p. 76, l. 25). Moreover, the rôle which Voltaire played in the *Encyclopédie* (Cf. "Voltaire was ever in the background, etc.") has been minimized in a recent study of Mr. Naves. It is still not sure that *Candide* is a reply to Rousseau (p. 102, l. 12). Nor is it yet certain that (p. 111, l. 15) "the *Sermon des cinquante* followed the extracts from Meslier." Furthermore the statement that Voltaire "had been working on" the *Portatif* since 1752 [to 1762] needs to be qualified (p. 120, l. 28). Finally, one might question whether Voltaire ever mastered Newton (p. 273, l. 21).

These points, insignificant in themselves, do not greatly detract from a presentation which on the whole may be classed as magnificent. Mr. Torrey is undoubtedly the American Scholar who best knows Voltaire and best appreciates his work. Whether he succeeded entirely in disclosing the inner nature of Voltaire will remain largely a matter of individual opinion. The exceeding complexity of the writer makes the task an almost insuperable one. It is to Mr. Torrey's credit that he has undertaken a task from which other Voltairian scholars have shrunk. If he has not done it perfectly, he can at least rest assured that his is the most complete work upon the subject.

IRA WADE

Princeton University

The Clandestine Organization and Diffusion of Philosophic Ideas in France from 1700 to 1750. By IRA O. WADE. Princeton University Press 1938. Pp ix + 329

Lanson, in 1912, pointed out the existence of manuscript treatises which circulated in France between 1700-1750. As he believed that the ideas contained in these hand-written compositions represent one of the important sources for the philosophic ideas expounded in the second half of the XVIIIth century, he expressed the hope that a scholar or scholars would undertake to study them and make a precise contribution to the history of ideas¹ Mr Wade has accomplished Lanson's desire, in a very large measure at least, with the competence that characterizes all of his work Mr Wade has uncovered 102 different treatises that deal in "an unorthodox fashion with religion, natural theology, problems of morality and politics." He has given precise indications of where copies of these treatises may be found, has given us an idea of their extensive diffusion, and has solved intricate problems of attribution. He has analyzed them carefully and has placed the proper emphasis on the most important contributors Cuppé, Meslier, Boulainvilliers, Fréret, Mirabaud, as well as on the most important anonymous pieces Mr Wade's book, in short, serves as an excellent reference compendium for philosophic ideas in France between 1700-1750 His main thesis confirms the belief that liberal doctrines seem to have developed concurrently in different countries in the first half of the century and that foreign flavor should not be exaggerated in the second half. It would have been difficult indeed to imagine that the intellectual and moral jolt suffered in France in 1685 would have resulted in sterility of thought and stifling of expression.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Wade, who knows the XVIIIth century so well, gives no background for his analyses. He is dealing not only with history of ideas but also with history of personal controversies and I believe that Mr Monod's method is preferable because he appreciated that "les philosophes n'attaquaient pas la forteresse du dogme sans viser à la fois des ennemis précis maintenant oubliés."² Although Mr. Wade has chosen for his book a title that is general enough, in it he often refers to "unorthodox doctrines" Under such circumstances it would have been fair to give his reader a few limiting definitions I must admit that I do not know what constitutes unorthodoxy at a time when internal quarrels of all sorts are rampant Furthermore as Mr Wade makes censorship responsible for the development of this manuscript genre, I wish he

¹ "Questions diverses sur l'histoire de l'esprit philosophique en France avant 1750" *R H L*, xix, 1-29

² Albert Monod's *De Pascal à Chateaubriand Les défenseurs du Christianisme de 1670 à 1802*, forms the counterpart of Mr Wade's study

had given us some definite idea of its functioning. He cites no work in his bibliography which would enlighten us. With our meager information, it seems to me sufficient to consider that we are dealing with the specialty of a certain coterie.³

Mr. Wade's book is difficult to read. He does not believe apparently in the use of footnotes for the elimination of details. Whereas he states that his "work seems to naturally fall into two parts: the history of the manuscript and an analysis contained in them," the history of the manuscripts and their detailed description is an annoying leitmotif in his book. I wonder also if these XVIIIth century philosophers took themselves as seriously as the seriousness with which they are treated indicates. It seems to me that the authors of the *Traité des trois imposteurs* must have grinned from ear to ear. The exclusion of an index is hardly pardonable.⁴ Lest my criticism should be misinterpreted, let me insist that Mr. Wade's book is definitely outstanding and deserves the highest praise for the material it purports to cover.

EMILE MALAKIS

The Jeremy Collier Stage Controversy, 1698-1726. By SISTER ROSE ANTHONY, S C Milwaukee. Marquette University Press, 1937. Pp. xv + 328. \$2.00.

There is so much of error, omission, and unscholarly method in this study that it will scarcely serve as a safe starting point for a new investigation. Altogether it provides a strong argument for the old contention that doctoral dissertations should not be published before they are thoroughly reworked and corrected.

³ It does not seem to have been difficult to circumvent censorship by the use of a foreign imprint or a misleading title. Lanson, *art. cit.*, gives a classical example of the stupidity of its functioning: "Je ne vois rien de saisissable que le *Robinson*, très mauvais ouvrage pour les mœurs et la religion, les *Aventures de Lazzarille* ne valent guère mieux, c'est un livre de laquais." Rocquain's list would tend to demonstrate laxity during 1715-1750, and the application of pressure around 1750. (*L'Esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution 1715-1789*, pp. 489 ff.) Cf. also A. Bachmann, *Censorship in France, 1715-1750: Voltaire's opposition*.

⁴ There are a few details which need revision. Mr. Wade mentions Lanson's *Manuel bibliographique*, 1914. Is he unaware of later revisions and supplements? Vicomte du Peloux' *Répertoire* does not deserve wasting any ink, why not use in its place the bibliography found in the *Z R Ph*, which keeps up to date? J. P. Belin's book should figure under general studies, its secondary title is significant: "Etude sur la diffusion des idées des philosophes à Paris d'après les documents concernant l'histoire de la librairie." A few counts do not seem accurate: the number of copies of *Le Ciel ouvert* is said to be 30 on p. 18, I count 29 on p. 15, so, for *Essay de métaphysique*, 19 on p. 18, p. 12, 23, *Opinion des anciens sur les Juifs*, 10 on p. 18, 11 on p. 16. Confusion: p. 18, *Extrait du Testament de Meslier*, p. 13, n° 43, *Extrait des sentiments de Jean Meslier*. My checking is of course incomplete.

The author attempts to establish Collier as a noble and heroic figure, and she accepts without a murmur the fact that he found nothing but filth and sacrilege in the works of Dryden, Wycherley, Congreve, and Vanbrugh. Her assertion (p. 8) that Collier displayed "indomitable courage" in attacking the theater cannot be taken seriously. He was well aware that his undertaking would please both church and state. In 1697 and the early months of 1698 William III and the Commons showed many signs of being interested in the suppression of "prophaneness and immorality." In 1697 appeared the first number of *The Occasional Paper*, containing this appeal (p. 7) "I cou'd heartily wish that some Lover of Vertue wou'd examine *all*, or at least those of them [*i. e.*, modern plays] which are most *usually* read and acted, and shew the *natural tendency* they have to Vice, and point out the *particular* Immoralities into which they may intrap the Unwary." Now the reputed and probable author of *The Occasional Paper* was Richard Willis, later Bishop of Winchester, who in 1694 and 1695 had been chaplain to William III in Holland, and who presumably knew something of the King's mind. It is interesting to note how well the *Short View* follows the method suggested by Willis. After the publication of the *Short View* the King ordered the charges against Collier to be dropped, and shortly afterwards the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to thank Collier for composing his attack on the stage (cf. Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation*, entry for 15 September 1698). Whether or not these are mere coincidences, Collier assuredly knew that he was on the winning side.

This study adds little to the bibliography of the Collier-controversy as given in J. W. Krutch's *Comedy and Conscience after the Restoration*. The author's dependence upon Krutch sometimes leads her astray as when, following him, she lists (p. 163) among works attacking Collier, *Feign'd Friendship or the Mad Reformer* (1699), for the "reformer" in this play is not Collier but a sprightly girl named Eugenia, and the object of her reform is no more than to reduce Lord Frolicksome to an honorable desire for matrimony. There are a great many works belonging to the Collier-controversy which this study might well have discussed, or at least listed. Farquhar's remarks about Collier are surely interesting enough to mention (cf. *Works*, ed. C. Stonehill [1930], I, 286; II, 207). By way of illustrating the spread of interest in the controversy one might point out that Sir William Anstruther's *Essays, Moral and Divine*, published at Edinburgh in 1701, repeats some of Collier's arguments (cf. pp. 147 ff.) In the periodicals of the day may be found certain interesting developments of which Sister Rose Anthony takes no account. For example, Defoe attacked the playhouse in his *Review*, but he also attacked Collier; and the *Rehearsal*, later collected under the title *A View of the Times*, representing the attitude of the High-Church party, vigorously de-

fended Collier and accused Defoe of being a friend to the stage (cf. *Critical Works of John Dennis* [Baltimore, 1939], I, 502). Of sufficient historical interest to warrant some attention is the entrance of the mercantile viewpoint in the attacks on the theater (cf., for example, *The Occasional Paper*, III, no IX [1719], pp 10 and 13, and the anonymous *Letter to the Right Honourable Sir Richard Brocas, Lord Mayor of London* [1730], pp 9, 17 and 18)

Sister Rose Anthony's attempt to assign several anonymous anti-stage pamphlets to Collier is unfortunate because it adds confusion to a subject already sufficiently confused. Her method of determining authorship by aligning parallel passages is dangerous at best; in this controversy, in which all arguments were repeated *ad nauseam* and all good phrases were freely borrowed, the method is absurd. Not one of her attributions of authorship is supported by acceptable evidence. *The Occasional Paper*, III, no IX, is definitely not by Collier (cf. *Works of Dennis*, I, 505), and it is altogether unlikely that he had any hand in *A Representation of the Impriety and Immorality of the English Stage*, published in 1704 (*ibid*, I, 501). On the other hand, certain anonymous pamphlets can be identified with some assurance. Sister Rose Anthony gives *The Antient and Modern Stages Survey'd* (1699) to James Drake on the grounds that Collier thought it was Drake's—certainly not conclusive evidence. Yet the treatise was advertised in contemporary periodicals as "By Dr Drake" (cf. *Post Boy*, issue of Feb 8-10, 1699/1700). Following Halkett and Laing she attributes *Some Thoughts concerning the Stage* (1704) to Woodward, but Dennis asserts that Collier was responsible for it (*Works of Dennis*, I, 319 and n.). She refuses to identify the author of the *Defence of Dramatick Poetry* and the *Farther Defence of Dramatick Poetry* (1698), which have usually been attributed to Filmer. But in the Huntington Library copy of the *Defence* the dedication is signed "E S", and since Farquhar wrote in 1699 that Settle had answered Collier (cf. *Works*, II, 207), there is little reason to doubt that these two works came from the pen of Elkanah. (Inasmuch as a good part of the *Defence* is devoted to championing Dryden, this identification is of peculiar interest.) The *Letter to A. H. Esq., concerning the Stage* (1698), which Sister Rose Anthony leaves anonymous, was apparently addressed to Anthony Hammond, and the author is probably to be found in Charles Hopkins (who had dedicated his *Poems and Translations* to Hammond) or another of the wits in his circle. One could go on indefinitely, the point is that a good deal of external evidence exists to aid us in determining the authorship of many anonymous pamphlets in the Collier-controversy, and this study has ignored such evidence.

We still need a full bibliography of the Collier-controversy, with the publication date of each item as closely as it can be ascertained from advertisements in the periodicals of the day (for a tentative list

of items from 1698 to 1700, with dates of publication, see *Works of Dennis*, I, 468-470). And a competent work on the subject will demand a keener perception of how each issue bears upon problems of literary theory than the author of the present study has displayed.

E. N. HOOKER

The University of California at Los Angeles

French Realism The Critical Reaction, 1830-1870 By BERNARD WEINBERG New York Modern Language Association of America, London Oxford University Press, 1937 Pp 259 \$2 50

The Novel of Adolescence in France, the Study of a Literary Theme By JUSTIN O'BRIEN. New York Columbia University Press, 1937. Pp. 240 \$2 50.

Four French Novelists, Marcel Proust, André Gide, Jean Giraudoux, Paul Morand By GEORGES LEMAÎTRE. London, New York, Toronto. Oxford University Press, 1938 Pp. xx + 419 \$3 50

Mr Weinberg studies French criticism of Realism from *Le Rouge et le Noir* to the Franco-Prussian War by making a careful examination of newspapers and reviews, as well as the non-periodical literature of France. More than a thousand pertinent items allow W to draw the following conclusions. The critics, in spite of their attacks upon Realism, tended to approve of certain of its aspects, such as the truthful representation of the real world and contemporaneity of subject, although they made serious objection to the emphasis on extreme detail, too minute observation, and the neglect of the ideal. One of their main objections lies in the fact that they believed the scientific methods of Realism implied a materialistic philosophy resulting in immorality and moral indifference. Some adverse criticism pointed to the exploitation of the trivial and the ugly. In general the critics, however, condoned these faults, if the writers showed literary artistry. For this reason Mérimée fared much better than Stendhal. In time a certain leniency toward the realists appeared so that, as W states, the account of Julien Sorel, had it appeared in the '60's, would have met with little opposition.

W reviews the criticism of the more important novelists such as Mérimée, Stendhal, Balzac, Champfleury, Murger, Flaubert, and the Goncourts and, because of the intimate relation between Realism and painting, devotes a chapter to Courbet and his group. In the

examination, classification, and organization of this material, he has followed a strictly scientific method, tabulating his results and displaying the utmost care in drawing conclusions. His monograph takes its place beside a number of important studies which have recently appeared on the contemporary criticism of Realism. All of these works have increased our knowledge and understanding of Realism, without perhaps changing any of our fundamental views of the movement as given by Bouvier and Martino. The volume is entirely worthy of its sponsor, the MLAA, which publishes it in its *General Series*.

George Sand first pointed out the necessity of a literature dealing with the adolescent but novelists waited until the post-World War period when "la complainte des pubertés difficiles" surpassed in popularity any other fictional subject. After a short time the adolescent usurped so much attention that Edmond Jaloux wrote in 1930, "il commence à y avoir dans le roman excès d'adolescents." Mr. Justin O'Brien examines the interesting subject of the large group of novels dealing with that 'period of transition between childhood and maturity.' The adolescent had no place in fiction before 1890 and by 1925 seemed to be occupying too much space. André Gide and especially his *Faux-Monnayeurs* assumes the most prominent position. "The debt which the youth of the post-war period in France owe to M. Gide, for better and worse, is incalculable." "M. André Gide bears a larger share of responsibility than any other writer for the value set upon the adolescent in contemporary French literature." O'Brien divides his work into two parts, origins and growth of the interest in adolescence and the adolescent as represented in the novel, while the more important chapters discuss the social and philosophical factors contributing to the interest in adolescence, the influence of Rimbaud, Lautréamont, Barrès, and that of Gide, and of the World War. In discussing the novels themselves he treats of the physical awakening, the intellectual and spiritual awakening, and spiritual unrest and disillusion.

In contemporary French literature one would experience considerable difficulty in finding a more interesting and important subject and a more satisfactory treatment than that of O'Brien, who has brought to his task extensive documentation, an adequate background, and critical acumen. The faults of such a study are inherent in the subject itself, which, being so near at hand, deprives us of the necessary perspective and at the same time offers such an abundance of material that the present volume should have had as its title, *The Introduction to the study of Novels of Adolescence in France*. O'Brien has limited himself to only those novels in which the central figure or figures remain adolescents, some hundred and ten works according to his list, but any definitive study would have to include that large body of fiction in which only a portion of the

story deals with pre-maturity period. Our proximity to many of the writers may warp our judgment. If the value of Gide seems fairly permanent, that of Cocteau and Radiguet appears less so. The effusions of the 'moins de vingt ans' may in the future be regarded as more clinical than literary.

Thibaudet pointed out that Taine, realizing the difficulties of the adolescent novel, abandoned his *Etienne Mayran*. The historian of this type of novel encounters similar obstacles. The sound scholarship of the present work gives to O'B. a prior claim to such important further investigations which he himself has already indicated. The subject should become an extended project in which collaborators will analyze this type of novel in other European countries. There existed many outside influences even in France. To the future historians of Jugend and giovinezza movements, O'B.'s further studies will prove invaluable.

In *Four French Novelists*, Marcel Proust, André Gide, Jean Giraudoux, Paul Morand, Mr. Georges Lemaître summarizes these writers who, he believes, "offer the most provocative and enlightening *exposé* of certain essential trends in contemporary French civilization and literature." One might question the inclusion of Giraudoux and Morand and seriously doubt whether the latter "will remain permanently one of the most invaluable and illuminating testimonies of the spirit of our age." L. has given us one of the best extended accounts in English of these novelists, supplying all the necessary information for a general view of each writer. He shows an abundant information, although one wonders how he missed Vigneron's definite settlement of the identity of Albertine. Since L. has in mind a general rather than a special public, he emphasizes lucid exposition rather than objective critical comment. In spite of certain personal judgments, inevitable in such a subject, he does not seek to impose upon his reader any novel interpretations of the significance of the novels under discussion. He writes the precise, exact English of an educated foreigner.

JAMES F. MASON

Cornell University

William Cowper, Humanitarian. By LODWICK C. HARTLEY. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. xii + 277.

The exceptional interest in Cowper during the past decade is gratifying to all who have felt that his personality and work deserve reorientation. Between 1928 and 1935 we had the entertainingly speculative and somewhat opinionative studies of Hugh P. A. Fausset (*William Cowper*), Lord David Cecil (*The Stricken Deer*), and

Gilbert Thomas (*William Cowper and the Eighteenth Century*), besides periodical publications and several as yet unprinted dissertations

In *William Cowper, Humanitarian*, Dr Hartley contributes a scholarly specialized study of the strictly inductive type, based almost wholly upon well-known published source material, and of course mainly upon Cowper's poetry and letters. The author is thorough-going, well-informed, judicious, and often rhetorically felicitous. His comprehensive treatment is presented in nine chapters, the first of which is introductory, "The Background of Eighteenth-Century Benevolence," and the last of which is a summary of the book. Between these, Dr Hartley studies Cowper's attitude toward the poor, the anti-slavery movement, foreign missions, the administration of India and the English prisons, war and peace, education, and animal life. His general procedure in each chapter is to present the historical situation in respect of the subject under consideration, including contributions to date by others, then to reveal Cowper's attitude by a comprehensive investigation of the evidence, finally to round out the study by a succinct summary of this investigation.

In emphasizing the background of Cowper's ideas the author sometimes seems to minimize the poet's independent origination. The large emphasis upon the rôle of John Wesley may tempt a reader to suspect a little special pleading. Others may question the propriety of including Cowper's views on education in a study of his humanitarianism. Students of Calvinism will not fully assent to all of Dr. Hartley's constructions of the doctrine. Excessive reliance upon Thomas Wright's consistently unreliable edition of Cowper's correspondence has involved the author in a futile argument and erroneous conclusions regarding the dating of the anti-slavery ballads (pp. 85 ff.), conclusions which would have been different had the correct dates of certain letters been known. But the pitiable defect in this generally capable and careful book is the amazing persistence of inaccurate quotation. Often the misquotation is a careless slip, in some instances the sense of the original is quite altered.

With the above exceptions, Dr. Hartley's book is one of the most scholarly of extended special studies of Cowper. If not an actual addition to our knowledge, it is a worthwhile assembling and harmonizing of evidence for one of the most important phases of Cowper's thinking. It emphasizes commendably—and certainly not too strongly—his influence upon the Evangelical Movement and upon eighteenth and early nineteenth century romanticism. It is indeed a competent if not an inspired study.

NEILSON C. HANNAY

Belmont, Massachusetts

My Leigh Hunt Library. The Holograph Letters. By LUTHER A. BREWER. Iowa City, Iowa University of Iowa Press, 1938. Pp. vi + 421.

This volume is the second of three which Mr. Brewer projected before his death to describe his collection of Huntiana, now the property of the University of Iowa Library. It was in page proof when he died, the arrangement of the material is his and is calculated primarily to give the reader an idea of the extent, contents, and format of the collection, and only secondarily to contribute to the knowledge of Hunt. Although the book follows a roughly chronological pattern and the letters are grouped by correspondents, the order in detail is determined by the form of the collection. Such an arrangement handicaps the general reader badly, for frequently series of letters that have been acquired at different times are broken up, violent chronological skips are taken, and there are a considerable number of miscellaneous isolated items. In addition, there has been little annotating. On the other hand, the index is excellent.

For the student of Hunt, however, who is prepared to make his own rearrangements and identifications, the volume is a rich source of information. The most extensive contribution is to our knowledge of Hunt's family relationships—the more valuable for the biographer since Hunt's own public writings and the previously published correspondence have left many blanks. For instance, the problem of the character of Mrs. Hunt, and of the effect of that character upon her husband and family, is greatly illuminated by the letters (covering nearly fifty years, from 1803 to 1852, and filling nearly a third of the text) to and from her. The devastating effect upon Hunt, his wife, and his children of his lack of sound financial sense becomes even more appallingly clear than it has been. Letters to and from John Hunt strengthen the outlines of that shadowy though solid figure. Letters from Hunt's mother throw light upon the background of the boy Leigh. Correspondence with Thornton and Julia Hunt shows Hunt's admirable though perhaps misguided devotion to his children. The reputation that Leigh Hunt alone of his family achieved is evidenced by his efforts to secure patronage from Lord John Russell and others for even grandsons and sons-in-law. Outside the family, there are important letters to and from Edmund Ollier, Arthur Hallam, the Brownings, *et al.*

From these scattered statements it should be apparent that the book is indispensable to any Hunt library.

G. D. STOUT

Washington University, St. Louis

BRIEF MENTION

R Browning, Hommes et Femmes, Poèmes choisis, Traduit, avec une Introduction par LOUIS CAZAMIAN. Paris, 1938 Pp. lxxiv + 76 + 340. M. Cazamian has translated and edited fifteen poems from *Men and Women*, and added a critical introduction which deals in part with such topics as "Le monologue de Browning," "Le rapport de la pensée et de la poésie chez Browning," and "Browning et la monologue contemporain." These are for the delight of critics in all lands.

Browning's use of psychology and his relation to modern psychological writers is what interests M. Cazamian especially and allows him to write most trenchantly. He recognizes that the author of *Men and Women* is an active force in the culture of to-day, and he sees that Browning's intense, minute, and passionate psychological studies have led to the frank exploitation in literature of the subconscious mind. But Browning, though a predecessor, is not one with the more recent portrayals of the subconscious self in England or France. His sense of moral order, of art, and perhaps of Victorian decency, prevented that. "Sa psychologie, même quand elle se communique, selon le mode de la poésie, par des moyens de suggestion et de synthèse, reste une psychologie de la conscience, non du subconscient."

M. Cazamian's interest in Browning's psychological poetry naturally dictates his choice of poems from *Men and Women* and directs the technique of his translations. Because of this interest, *Bishop Blougram's Apology* is given an emphasis which will surprise English readers, and because of this interest *Childe Roland* is accorded a superb introduction and translation (no mean feat). The treatment of *How it strikes a Contemporary* is unexpectedly disappointing. In his translations M. Cazamian's first interest is in conveying Browning's thought in all its density. The translations are almost interlinear, yet subtle and alive, little is lost save some of the haunting cadences of such lyrics as *Love among the Ruins* and *Two in the Campagna*. The renderings of the blank verse monologues are worthy to be placed besides Legouis's translations in rhyme of Chaucer and Spenser.

WILLIAM C. DE VANE

Yale University

Lesebuch des deutschen Volkshedes. Edited by JOHN MEIER and ERICH SEEMANN. Part I. Das Volkshied im Leben des Volkes. Part II. Individual und Lied der Gemeinschaft in ihren wechselseitigen Beziehungen. Literarhistorische Bibliothek Band

19 Berlin Junker und Dunnhaupt, 1937 Pp 188 and 189. RM 3 40 each. The two parts of volume 19 of this well-known collection are a welcome addition to our literature on German folksong. Volume 16 of this series presented the various aspects of the German *Soldatenlied*. In part one of the present volume the professional folksong is given only a comparatively small space, the rest deals with singing and songs that are or were part of the life of the people during work hours, festivals, and leisure hours. The student of German *Volkskunde* is called upon to study the form as well as the contents of such songs and connect them with other folk customs during the same periods of the day or year. The second volume permits the student to study the interrelation between individual poetical expression and folk lyrics and ballads. The arrangement is according to content, and within each division the order is chronological. From the variations interesting illustrations may be obtained for the forces that are at work in the modeling of a typical folksong and contrasted with the changing forms of literary movements as expressed in the poems by individual authors. The introductions to the two booklets are only generally informative, and the notes refer more to actual sources than to works of reference. In survey courses of German literature and in courses on German folklore both volumes may be used to advantage. Neither volume has an index or a bibliography.

WERNER NEUSE

Middlebury College

Shakespeare and the Post Horses. By J. CROFTS. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith, for the University of Bristol, 1937. Pp. 232. 10s 6d. A possible topical allusion by Shakespeare in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (iv, v, 77-81) gives rise to a book. The writer, pp 23 ff, finds an incident involving unscrupulous dealing in post horses by the Howards, the greatest of the Howards being Charles Howard, Lord Admiral, head of the Admiral's Men, rivals of Shakespeare's company. This incident on November 17 (or thereabouts), 1597, he thinks the audience would catch a reference to much more naturally than the Mompelgart incident of 1592, now generally supposed to be alluded to by Shakespeare in "cozen gar-mombles" since Elizabeth, possibly present at the play, had spoken of "our cousin Mompelgart." Many intensely interesting details are brought to light as to the Howard post-horse incident, as to the relations of Howard and Essex in 1597, and the bearing of all these incidents on the probability of the Howard incident being referred to by Shakespeare. Like almost all the numerous books and articles nowadays postulating the eternal consciousness on the part of the Elizabethan audience of the affairs of the superman, Essex, as against all the other Elizabethan supermen, the book

tends at times to be extremely speculative and conjectural. The by-products of the books are sometimes valuable. On page 20 is to be found the following

The truth seems to be that Mumpellgait's career as a horsey character began in 1840 under the management of Charles Knight. Shakespeare's contemporaries knew nothing of it, and the effect of this affair at Graves end, if duly considered, is to eliminate him from the inquiry altogether

Chapter xvi will prove interesting to all scholars who are convinced by the attempts of Dover Wilson and Robertson to reconstruct all the different stages through which a play has passed on its way of evolution to the Shakespeare play. It is difficult to see how a scholar could reach a final conclusion in regard to the problem involved in this book without once referring to what E. K. Chambers and Kittredge have had to say on the subject (*Shakespeare A Study of Facts and Problems*, I, 435, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, p. 64).

GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR

The University of North Carolina

Shakespeare's Young Lovers. By E. E. STOLL. The Alexander Lectures at the University of Toronto, 1935. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. x + 118. \$1.75. This book consists of three lectures, one on *Romeo and Juliet*, one on "The Maidens of Shakespeare's Prime," the third on "The Maidens in the Dramatic Romances." As usual, Mr. Stoll's observations are full of sound sense, and though they contain, in this volume, nothing very original, they clarify our understanding of Shakespeare's way of writing and sharpen our appreciation of his characters. One of Mr. Stoll's main points is that Shakespeare's method "is imaginative and immediate, impulsive and emotional, dramatic or at least structural and poetic, not (happily) psychological or sociological," and from this point of view he describes the characters of the young lovers. He distinguishes between their different ways of speaking, their different rhythms and their different images—"in poetry is their origin and in poetry is their being." Their characters are not structures, but "poetic evocations," and they are to be explained, he observes, "not on the basis of the poet's experience, whereof we know nothing, but of his art whereof we should know something." This is a sensible and rewarding attitude to take, and it enables Mr. Stoll to be at his best when, at the end of the book, he attacks the romantic view which tries to relate Shakespeare's biography to the subject matter and tone of the plays. Not that Mr. Stoll's book is itself entirely without a romantic flavor: his descriptions of Shakespeare's heroines gives them a kind of romantic glow, but this is doubtless a part of his purpose, and his re-creations are lifelike and refreshing.

Harvard University

THEODORE SPENCER

CORRESPONDENCE

CORRECTIONS TO THE SHIELDS BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ITALIAN TRANSLATIONS¹

N C Shields in her useful bibliography of *Italian Translations in America* (New York, 1931) does not list in her chapter on anthologies Longfellow's *Poets and Poetry of Europe* (Philadelphia, 1845, numerous reprints), although this work contains an impressive section of translations from the Italian. Its bibliography of translations would have been useful, as it mentions a study by Richard Henry Wilde, *Conjectures and Researches concerning the Love, Madness, and Imprisonment of Torquato Tasso* (New York, 1842), from which Longfellow drew translations, by Wilde, of one canzone and seventeen sonnets from Tasso's *Rime*. Wilde's two-volume essay contains, besides two poems from Guarini, fragmentary translations from Tasso's verse, many letters, and complete versions of 28 of Tasso's minor poems. It constitutes therefore the most important Tasso anthology ever made by an American and deserved inclusion in Miss Shields's study, along with similar works that she lists (Nos 101 and 133).

Her description (No 56) of Piero Maroncelli's volume of *Additions to My Prisons, Memoirs of Silvio Pellico* (Cambridge, 1836) contains inaccuracies which might have been avoided in part by the use of A H Lograsso's article on "Piero Maroncelli in America," which had appeared in 1928 in *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento* (xv, 894-941). The "Biographical Notice of Silvio Pellico" which begins the volume was translated by Andrews Norton, as we learn from Miss Lograsso, and not by Mrs Norton, who had made the translation of Pellico's work, but earlier than Miss Shields believes, in 1833, before the appearance of Roscoe's English version of the same year. Andrews Norton used an Italian text newly written by Maroncelli, as indicated in the opening paragraphs, and not, as Miss Shields assumes, Latour's French biographical sketch of 1833 on which Maroncelli had collaborated and from which he does include excerpts here. Like Miss Lograsso, Miss Shields is non-committal as to the translator of the *Addizioni* themselves. It appears that this translation had already been made in 1833, by Mrs William Duer (wife of the President of Columbia College) and Mrs John Duer (Anna Bedford Bunner), and was revised (and completed in the appendices, as Miss Shields correctly notes) by Miss Sedgwick, for Maroncelli, recently arrived in New York, writes to Mr Norton on January 1, 1834: "queste sono già state tradotte qui dalle Signore Duer, ed io le sto rivedendo coll'assistenza di buoni letterati, e prima di tutti della Signora Sedgwick" (see Lograsso, *loc cit*, p 911). There is no mention of Fitz-Greene Halleck's acknowledged contribution (p 222) of a brief translation, made early in 1834, of the lyric which Maroncelli had composed in prison while awaiting his amputation, "Winds of the wakened spring" (cf *Life and Letters of Fitz-Greene Halleck*, New

¹I am grateful to Professor Chandler B Beall of the University of Oregon for suggesting some of the corrections included here.

York, 1869, pp 363 f), nor of the blank verse translation of Maroncelli's *Carme delle Rimembranze di Pallavicini* (pp 246-255) volunteered by an anonymous American translator, no doubt Miss Johnson, the actress and singer, whom Maroncelli and others mention specifically as a contributor to the volume Miss Shields incorrectly lists as translations from Maroncelli the two short poems which end the book Actually, these are pieces by unnamed American authors which Maroncelli has appended to his volume, adding to each his own translation into Italian verse Curiously enough, they have gone unrecognized by all who have described the volume except an anonymous and forgotten reviewer in the *Knickerbocker Magazine* of October, 1836 (VIII, 483), who remarks "In the appendix, the author has translated into Italian poetry, very happily, some charming verses by the Hon Mr Wilde, and Mrs Ellet" The first selection is Richard Henry Wilde's lyric "My life is like the summer rose," published first as a song in 1815 or 1816 by Dubois and Stodart, New York Maroncelli's translation, beginning "Estiva rosa somiglia mia vita," is not mentioned by A H Starke in "Richard Henry Wilde Some Notes and a Check-List," *American Book Collector*, IV (1933), 226-232, 285-288, V (1934), 7-10, and was probably published without the knowledge even of Wilde, who was then in Italy The second poem is a pair of quatrains by Elizabeth F Ellet beginning "Like southern birds whose wings of light," and Maroncelli's somewhat expanded paraphrase (a defective sonnet) begins "Pennuto abitator di rive australi" Mrs Ellet's verses had appeared in her *Poems, Translated and Original* (Philadelphia, 1835, p 41), a volume which Miss Shields describes (No 1276), but without mention of Maroncelli

MARY KESSI

The University of Oregon

MELBANCKE AND GOSSON I regret that, because of an erroneous report from a research assistant, I repeated in my note on Melbancke and Gosson (*MLN*, LIV, 111-114) a number of parallels already noted by Professor Rollins in *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology*, vol. XVIII

D C ALLEN

Duke University

AN ANSWER TO DR TILLYARD I was amazed to find in Dr Tillyard's review of my book on "Milton's Projected Epic" (*MLN*, May, 1938, pp 382 ff) the statement that in my opinion Milton's projected epic "would have been a fanatical messianic outburst, prompted by the meanest motives of self-interest" I suggest that there is nothing in my text to warrant such a conclusion

H MUTSCHMANN

Marburg

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIV

JUNE, 1939

Number 6

MARGINALIEN ZU HEINE II

Ideen. Das Buch Le Grand. Kap. VII. a)

“. . . manche Potentaten wurden [durch Napoleon] von Haus und Hof gejagt und mußten auf andre Art ihr Brot zu verdienen suchen, und einige legten sich daher fruh auf ein Handwerk und machten z. B. Siegellack . . .” (Walzel iv, S. 163).

W. Siebert, *H. Heines Beziehungen zu E. T. A. Hoffmann* (Marburg 1908) S. 19, verweist auf den *Kater Murr* (Grisebachs Ausgabe x, S. 117), wo an die Zeit des politischen und sozialen Umsturzes der französischen Revolution erinnert wird, “als Marquis Siegellack fabrizierten” Obwohl das Sinn und Witz der Heimestelle—ein Potentat legt sich aufs Handwerk, noch eh er entthront wurde, er baut kluglich vor—gar nicht trifft, haben Petersen (Walzel iv, S. 509) und Elster (²iv, S. 513) diese Erklärung angenommen Zu Unrecht. Eine Anekdote, die in Maximilian Heines *Erinnerungen* mitgeteilt wird, auch ungefähr in die Entstehungszeit des *Buchs Le Grand* fallen muß (Houben Nr. 157), witzelt deutlicher mit “des Kaisers Siegellack,” und der Berichterstatter fugt selber die Deutung an es sei “allgemein bekannt, dass der damalige Kaiser Franz von Oesterreich die große Passion hatte, freie Augenblicke der Anfertigung von Siegellack in allen möglichen Farben zu widmen.” Offenbar ist dieselbe Spitze verborgen in einer Bemerkung der “Einleitung zu Kahldorf” (Walzel v, S. 401 f.) “Oesterreich . . . besorgte die Adelsinteressen, und auf jedem feigen Vertraglein, das gegen den Liberalismus geschlossen wurde, prangt obenan das wohlbekannte Siegellack”

Ideen. Das Buch Le Grand. Kap. VII. b)

Erich Loewenthal, *Studien zu Heines “Reisebildern”* (*Palaestra* 138, Berlin und Leipzig 1922) S. 5 f. macht die sehr treffende, von der Forschung noch lange nicht genug verwertete Bemerkung, daß

die autobiographischen Notizen, die Heine zwanglos in seine Schriften einzuschreiben liebt, durchaus nicht Mystifikation bedeuten, sondern zu allermeist der historischen Nachprüfung standhalten. Aber er widerspricht sich gleich selbst, wenn er (S. 6) die Notiz am angeführten Orte. "In diesem Augenblick fällt mir ein, daß ich dem Lowenwirt in Bologna noch fünf Taler schuldig bin" (Walzel iv, S. 165) für bloßen Scherz halt, weil das doch vor Heines Reise nach Italien geschrieben sei. Schon Elster (²iv, S. 513) hat richtig gesehen, daß Bologna hier nur romantisierender Deckname für Göttingen sei (wird doch auch sonst in dem Stück ein nördlicheres Geschehen an die Brenta und den Ganges transportiert), aber seine Begründung ist ungeschickt. Nicht auf Nr. 80 der *Herkunft* war zu verweisen, wo in ähnlicher Weise aus der hannoverschen Universitätsstadt ein spanisches Salamanka wird, sondern auf die *Bader von Lucca*, Kap v, Schluß. "Göttingen ist in Bologna lange nicht so bekannt, wie man schon, der Dankbarkeit wegen, erwarten durfte, indem es sich das deutsche Bologna zu nennen pflegt." Und auch sachlich durfte keineswegs bloßer Phantasiescherz vorliegen, vielmehr heitere Anspielung auf die sehr reale Tatsache, daß Heine (nach Varnhagens Zeugnis; vgl. Houben S. 100) noch von seinem Doktorschmaus her "einen Anker Wein" schuldig war.

Italien. Reise von München nach Genua. Kap. VIII u. XIX.

Gegen Kaiser Franz wird in den *Reisebildern* häufiger gestichelt, als die Kommentatoren bisher bemerkt haben. Der Witz mit den Engländern in der Innsbrucker Hofkirche, die den Reiseführer verkehrt gebrauchen und dessen Angaben mit den Statuen um Maximilians Grab zu falscher und sehr komischer Deckung zwingen, ist keineswegs als billiger Spaß um seiner selbst willen angebracht, sondern um die boshafte Pointe: sollte es "dem jetzigen Kaiser einfallen, sich in einem Reifrock oder gar in Windeln gießen zu lassen—wer wurde was dagegen einwenden" (Walzel iv, S. 243)—in so harmlose Umgebung einzuschmuggeln, daß der Zensor nichts merkt.

Wenn dergestalt Kaiser Franz schon hier altes Weib und Wickelkind gescholten ist, so wird man auch einen "Romulus Augustulus II," unter dem "das heilige römische Reich . . . zu Grunde ging," und zwar in "neuester Zeit" (Walzel iv, S. 269), nicht mit Elster

(²IV, S. 189) auf den, deutschen Lesern so unbekannten wie gleichgültigen und obendrein schon verstorbenen, sizilischen Ferdinand (†1825) beziehen, sondern auf den Habsburger, der unter dem Namen Franz der *Zweite* als letzter die alte Kaiserkrone getragen hat.

Reisebilder III. Reise von München nach Genua

Den Panegyricus des 33. Kapitels auf Peter Cornelius beschließt Heine mit der pietätvollen Erinnerung daran, daß die Hand des großen Malers "einst liebevoll auf den kleinen Fingern lag und mir einige Gesichtskonturen ziehen half, als ich, ein kleines Bübchen, auf der Akademie zu Dusseldorf zeichnen lernte."—Petersens Kommentar (Walzel IV, S. 524) glaubt hier einen Gedächtnisfehler des Autors, Verwechslung mit dem älteren Bruder Lambert Cornelius (1778-1823), seinerzeitigem Inspektor der Dusseldorfer Akademie, feststellen zu müssen. Mit Unrecht. In einem Gespräch über Heine vom 19. März 1865 gibt Peter selbst eine ergötzliche Erklärung: "Ich habe ihn auch einmal durchgeprügelt . . . Der Lambert ging immer um 11 Uhr aus der Akademie, um eine Stunde außer dem Hause zu geben, und da mußte ich Praceptor spielen. Neben der Elementarklasse war das Zimmer, wo ich stand und malte, es war, ich weiß es noch genau, ein Altarbild. Die Jungen aber, statt zu zeichnen, machten furchtbaren Lärm. Ich ging also hinein und verbot es ihnen, und so ging es eine Weile. Bald aber fingen sie noch viel ärger an. Ich stürzte also in die Klasse. In der linken Hand hielt ich die Palette wie Achilles seinen Schild, in der rechten hatte ich den Malstock, und packte mir nun den ersten, der mir in die Hände kam. Das war der Heine. Ich habe den Malstock auf ihm zerschlagen und ihn schwer geprügelt."

(Herman Riegel, *Peter Cornelius*, Berlin 1883, S. 76.—In diesem Buche, das der Heine-Forschung entgangen zu sein scheint, denn weder Bieber noch Houbern führen es an, findet sich auch eine interessante Mitteilung über Heines Eltern [S. 12 f.] und die Wiedergabe eines bedeutsamen Gesprächs [S. 68]. Peter Cornelius erzählt, "daß er Heine einmal in München [1827/8] auf dem Dultplatze eines Sonntags Vormittags begegnet und ordentlich und gerade heraus mit ihm gesprochen habe; Heine habe alles ruhig mit angehört und endlich halb wehmütig gesagt: 'Ich bin doch am Ende nicht so schlimm als Sie meinen.'"")

Italien. Die Bader von Lucca. Kap. I.

Sein Zwiegespräch mit der Engländerin Mathilde beendet der Erzähler also. "Es ist gut, daß wir uns wiedergefunden, und der große deutsche—wird sich wieder ein Vergnügen daraus machen, sein Leben bei Ihnen zu wagen" (Walzel iv, S 323). Die Kommentare schweigen zu dieser Stelle. Aber ich glaube nicht, daß sie jeder Leser auch ohne Belehrung versteht. Der Gedankenstrich ersetzt offenbar ein fehlendes Wort. Welches?—Derjenige, der sich ein Vergnügen daraus machen wird, bei, mit Mathilde zu leben, kann natürlich nur Heine sein. Er hatte sich schon im ersten Teil der *Reisebilder* (1826), in Nr. XIII der *Hemkehr-Gedichte*, frank und frech als einen der besten und bekanntesten deutschen Dichter selbstgelobt (Walzel i, S 114), im zweiten Teil (*Das Buch Le Grand*, Walzel iv, S. 185) wenigstens scherzhafter Weise unter den "grossen Männern" der Weltgeschichte sich mitangeführt, genau so mochte er sich jetzt wieder als "der große deutsche Dichter" bezeichnen. Aber das für Heine so charakteristische Zwielicht von Ernst und Spaß, von Pathos und Ironie, in das er den Ausspruch getaucht haben wollte, war qualender und also wirksamer, wenn das absichtlich schockierende Wort unausgesprochen und doch erratbar blieb.

Italien. Die Bader von Lucca. Kap. VIII.

Der Schluß dieses Kapitels ist wohl die schwerstverständliche Stelle der ganzen *Reisebilder* und bislang völlig ungeklärt. Petersen (bei Walzel iv, S 527) schweigt sich ganzlich darüber aus, Elster (²iv, S. 537 f.) stellt bedauernd fest, er habe über den berühmten Kinderball im Hause Rothschild "leider nichts Genaueres zu ermitteln" gewußt. Sollte er naiverweise an die Wirklichkeit eines solchen Balls geglaubt haben? Die Geschichte gibt sich doch unverkennbar als phantastische Groteske. Hyacinth Hirsch, seiner guten Beziehungen zur höchsten Plutokraten-Dynastie sich rühmend, erzählt, er habe in Frankfurt auch den (seit 1820 in Wien ¹residierenden!) Baron Salomon Rothschild kennen gelernt und allerlei Freundliches von ihm erfahren: "er behandelte mich ganz wie seines Gleichen, ganz famillionar. Ich war auch bei ihm auf

¹ Vgl. Egon Caesar Conte Corti, *Der Aufstieg des Hauses Rothschild* (Leipzig 1927), S. 245

dem berühmten Kinderball, der in der Zeitung gestanden. So viel Pracht bekomme ich mein Lebtag nicht mehr zu sehen . . . wie viel Gold und Silber und Diamanten habe ich dort gesehen! Wie viel Sterne und Orden! Den Falkenorden, das goldene Vlies, den Lowenorden, den Adlerorden—sogar ein ganz klein Kind, ich sage Ihnen ein ganz klein Kind trug einen Elefantenorden. Die Kinder waren gar schon maskiert und spielten Anleihe, und waren angezogen wie die Könige, mit Kronen auf den Köpfen, ein großer Junge aber war angezogen prächtig wie der alte Nathan Rothschild. Er machte seine Sache sehr gut, hatte beide Hände in der Hosentasche, klimperte mit Geld, schüttelte sich verdrießlich, wenn einer von den kleinen Königen was geborgt haben wollte, und nur dem kleinen mit dem weißen Rock und den roten Hosen streichelte er freundlich die Backen und lobte ihn: 'Du bist mein Plaisir, mein Liebling, mein' Pracht, aber dein Vetter Michel soll mir vom Leib bleiben, ich werde diesem Narrn nichts borgen, der täglich mehr Menschen ausgibt, als er jährlich zu verzehren hat; es kommt durch ihn noch ein Unglück in die Welt, und mein Geschäft wird darunter leiden.' So wahr mir Gott alles Gute gebe, der Junge machte seine Sache sehr gut, besonders wenn er das dicke Kind, das in weißen Atlas mit echten silbernen Lilien gewickelt war, im Gehen unterstützte und bisweilen zu ihm sagte. 'Na, na, du, du, fuhr dich nur gut auf, ernähr dich redlich, sorg, daß du nicht wieder weggejagt wirst, damit ich nicht mein Geld verliere' " (Walzel IV, S. 358 f.).

Elsters wenige Anmerkungen zu diesem Abschnitte führen nicht weit, gehen zum Teil auch fehl. Richtig ist, daß "der Kleine mit dem weißen Rock und den roten Hosen" auf den so fleißig gehandelten Kaiser Franz zielt, was nicht zuletzt die analoge Bezeichnung des österreichischen Herrschers als des "Kaisers, der einen weißen Rock und rote Hosen trägt," im 12. Kap. der *Reise von München nach Genua* (Walzel IV, S. 251) erweist.² Zu dieser Deutung also brauchte Elster (IV, S. 538) kein Fragezeichen zu setzen. Daß die Verbindung der Rothschilds mit dem Hause Oesterreich besonders eng war, bezeugt Cortis Darstellung, besonders in den zwei letzten Kapiteln, fast auf jeder Seite. Hingegen mochte ich bestreiten, daß die aufgezählten Orden tatsächlich jene Länder bezeichnen sollen, in

² Vgl. auch Walzel IX, S. 11, Z. 14, wo Metternich genannt wird "der Ex-Wesir so vieler praadamitischen Sultane, die alle weiße Rocke und rote Hosen getragen"

denen sie ihre heraldische Heimat haben (Elster a. a. O.), Heine treibt vielmehr ein loses Spiel mit den unterschiedlichen Tiernamen (es ist doch auffallend, daß er nur "tierische" Orden nennt), die er bis zum Elefanten steigert. An Siam hat er dabei gewiß nicht gedacht, umsoweniger als (was Elster übersah), der siamesische Elefantenorden erst 1861 gestiftet worden ist, vorgeschwebt haben kann ihm nur der ebenso bezeichnete älteste und höchste dänische Orden (Vgl. Berlien, *Der Elefantenorden und seine Rutter*, Kopenhagen 1846). "Das dicke Kind, das in weißen Atlas mit echten silbernen Lilien gewickelt war," ist selbstverständlich auf Frankreich zu beziehen, ob mit Elster noch genauer auf den (bereits am 16. Sept. 1824 verschiedenen) wohlbeleibten Ludwig XVIII (denn Karl X. war sehr mager), bleibt fraglich, man kann das immerhin mit dem Hinweis stützen, daß es Ludwig XVIII. nur vermoge der Rothschildschen Geldhilfe möglich war, wenige Tage nach Napoleons Abdankung schon in Calais zu landen und seinen Einzug in Paris zu halten. Trifft Elsters Deutung zu, so erleichtert sie aus chronologischen Gründen die Lösung des Gesamt rätsels.

Prüft man die Groteske genauer, so ergibt sich eine schier unbegreifliche Lucke in der Erzählung. Nirgends wird verraten, wo denn eigentlich der "Kinderball" stattgefunden hat. Bei Salomon Rothschild, heißt es zwar ausdrücklich, aber unklar bleibt, in welcher Stadt. In Frankfurt etwa? Dann mußte es vor 1820 geschehen sein, ehe Salomon nach Wien zog; aber der eigentliche Glanz und Einfluß der Rothschilds ereignete sich erst jenseits dieses Datums. Also in Wien? Aber von einem Wiener Aufenthalt spricht Hyacinth Hirsch nicht. Offenbar ist die Übertragung des eigentlich Gemeinten auf die Ballgeschichte etwas oberflächlich geraten, und gerade dieser Umstand bestärkt den "Verdacht" des Schlüssel-Charakters.

Es ist die Rede von einem großen, einem strahlenden Fest, wo Kinder, als Könige maskiert, Anleihe spielen; Salomon gibt das Fest, aber der "große Junge," der den Weltbankier stellt, trägt nicht seine, sondern Nathans Maske.

Daran entspricht zunächst soviel der Wirklichkeit, daß der in London etablierte Nathan, obwohl nur der drittälteste der fünf Frankfurter Brüder, als eigentlicher Kopf und Leiter des ganzen Hauses galt und wirkte (Corti a. a. O. S. 160, 331, 346, 368). Aber der Veranstalter des Balls ist und bleibt Salomon.

Ein Ball? Kinder als Könige maskiert, ein rauschendes Fest, unabsehbar von Gold und Diamanten, Sternen und Orden strahlend. Konnte es nicht so gemeint sein, daß eine Versammlung von Fürsten und Königen, bei der es prunkhaft zugeht und alle Wurdenträger in großer Gala aufziehen, dem kritischen Betrachter als bloße Kinderei erscheint, zumal dann, wenn Versammlung und Beratung jedes tieferen Ernstes, allen wertvollen Ergebnisses ermangeln?

Wir sahen uns dann verwiesen auf einen leerlaufenden Diplomaten- und Fürstenkongress. In erster Linie wäre an den von Verona (20. Oktober 1822) zu denken, dessen Pracht H. von Treitschke (*Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* III, Leipzig 1885, S. 271) und A. Stern (*Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815* II, Berlin 1897, S. 292) gleich eindrucksvoll schildern. "Seit dem Wiener Kongress war dem Weltteil ein ähnliches Schauspiel nicht geboten worden." Anwesend waren Kaiser Franz mit mehreren Erzherzogen, der Zar Alexander, der König von Preußen mit den Prinzen Wilhelm und Karl, die Könige von Sardinien und Neapel, der Kronprinz von Schweden, eine ganze Schar italienischer Kleinfürsten und Prinzen, sie alle begleitet von ausgiebigem Beamten-Stab.³ In der österreichischen Delegation befand sich neben Metternich und Gentz auch Salomon Rothschild. Ihm blühte hier gar uppig der Weizen. Mit den Vertretern des Zarenreichs schloß er eine fette Anleihe ab, wofür ihm noch der Wladimirden verliehen ward, was die beiden größten deutschen Zeitungen, die Augsburger *Allgemeine* und der *Oesterreichische Beobachter*, gebührend in die Öffentlichkeit brachten, und er fand auch sonst hier Gelegenheit zu glänzenden Geschäften. So glänzende und weitreichende Geschäfte eröffneten sich, daß rasch noch zwei andere Rothschilds, James aus Paris und Carl aus Neapel, nach Verona eilten.⁴ Da konnte im Hohlspiegel des Spottes das Antlitz des Kongresses leicht dahin verzerrt werden, als sei das Ganze eine Veranstaltung der Rothschilds gewesen, ein Kinderball.

Ich will nicht behaupten, dies sei die einzig mögliche Deutung der Groteske. Vielmehr werfe ich selber als entscheidend die Frage auf, ob Heines Leser im Jahr 1830 solche Anspielungen auf ein Ereignis von 1822 noch verstehen konnten. Aber keinen Zweifel zu

³ Ludwig XVIII war durch sein Gichtleiden an der Teilnahme verhindert, aber immerhin durch fünf Gesandte vertreten

⁴ Vgl. Corti, a a O S 299-304

leiden scheint mir, daß auch im Verneinungsfalle die endgültige Auflösung des Ratsels nur in der Richtung meines, sei's auch vorläufig problematischen, Vorstoßes zu finden sei

Mit der gleichen Zurückhaltung versuche ich mich noch an zwei Einzelheiten. Wer ist "Vetter Michel"? Elster a. a. O. enthält sich jeder Meinungsäußerung. Wenn eine Deutung aus der Zeitgeschichte zulässig ist, so kann man an zweierlei denken. Entweder ist der Name mit Anlehnung an den "deutschen Michel" gebildet und meint den eigentlichen deutschen Großstaat, also Preußen, das vermöge streng durchgeführter allgemeiner Wehrpflicht eine militärische Kraft besaß, die in gar keinem Verhältnis stand zu dem vergleichsweise geringen Umfang und der noch geringeren Finanzkraft dieses Staatswesens, und die auf liberaler Seite nicht gern gesehen, umso lieber als Bedrohung des Weltfriedens verdächtigt wurde,⁵ oder man darf den Namen wortlich nehmen, dann muss es der portugiesische Reaktionsführer und Kronprätendent Dom Miguel sein, der nach dem Mißlingen seines Putsches vom 30. April 1824 nach Wien in die Verbannung ging und vom österreichischen Hofe, bezhw durch Metternich seither vielfach protegirt wurde. Trifft diese Erklärung das Rechte, so durfte auch das "ganz klein Kind" mit dem Elefantenorden seine historische Gleichung finden.⁶

Als König Johann VI. von Portugal am 10. März 1826 starb, verzichtete sein ältester Sohn, Dom Pedro, der sich schon am 12. Oktober 1822 zum Kaiser von Brasilien und vom Vater unabhängig erklärt hatte, aus Inkompatibilitätsgründen auf den Thron des Mutterlands, und zwar zu Gunsten seiner erst siebenjährigen (am 4. April 1819 geborenen) Tochter Maria da Gloria, die mit Dom Miguel verlobt und, nach Erreichung des nötigen Alters, vermählt werden sollte. Dadurch wäre, da das königliche Kind eine Enkelin von Kaiser Franz war (Dom Pedro war 1817-1826 mit dessen

⁵ Im Winter 1829/30, also gerade als Heine mit der Niederschrift der *Bader von Lucoa* beschäftigt war, unterhandelte Preussen mit dem Hause Rothschild tatsächlich über eine grössere Anleihe, die schließlich auch zustande kam (vgl. Corti S. 404 f.).

⁶ Wofern solche Erklärung nicht von vornherein zu weit hergeholt ist und die Ironie der Stelle weit einfacher darauf weist, daß einer der kleinsten europäischen Staaten (daher die Bezeichnung "ganz klein Kind", auf dem Balle sind ja die Monarchien alle durch Kinder repräsentiert) den Orden mit dem mächtigsten Tiere schmückt und benennt.

Tochter Leopoldine vermählt), in der Tat eine Art Vetternschaft Dom Miguels mit dem Hause Habsburg gestiftet worden Die Umtriebe des intransigenten Prinzen beunruhigten bisweilen ganz Europa, das dadurch besonders 1. J. 1826 an den Rand eines allgemeinen Kriegs gebracht war, dessen Gefahr eine berühmte energische Parlamentsrede Cannings vom 12. Dez. 1826 zugleich beschwor und bannte Diese Rede, die in aller Öffentlichkeit mit dem Gedanken der Entfesselung der revolutionären Kräfte des alten Kontinents spielte, sich an die liberalen Geister aller Völker wandte, hatte auf Heine, der ja in Canning (unberechtigterweise) einen Märtyrer des Liberalismus verehrte (vgl. Walzel IV, S. 301 f.; VI, S. 148), zweifellos nachhaltigen Eindruck geubt Daß sich Heine mit der Person Dom Miguels beschäftigt hat, bezeugen andre seiner Schriften, vor allem die am 8. März 1831 aufgesetzte *Einleitung zu Kahldorf über den Adel*, wo jener ein "gekronter Wicht" gescholten wird, "der dem Stande [der Könige] Unehre macht" (Walzel VI, S. 405, 513) ⁷ Es ware also sehr wohl möglich, daß der Dichter schon 1829 seiner Abneigung Ausdruck verliehen hat.

Daß die Rothschilds jeden Krieg—von welcher Art Michel er auch angezettelt werden mochte—als geschäftestörend perhorreszierten, belegt (wenn es solchen Beweises überhaupt bedurfte) Cortis Buch an vielen Stellen (z. B. S. 307)

Italien. Die Bäder von Lucca Kap. XI.

Fritz Friedlander, *Heine und Goethe* (Berlin und Leipzig 1932) S. 39, hat—so weit ich sehe, als Erster—erkannt, daß der "ernste Adler," von dem der vorletzte Absatz in Kap. III der *Stadt Lucca* so viel zu sagen weiß, eine Allegorie auf Goethe bedeutet. Aber auch ihm ist entgangen, daß in gleicher Verhüllung schon die Platen-Diatribe eine kleine Huldigung für Goethe anbringt. Platen wird dort (Walzel IV, S. 400) mit dem Vogel Strauß verglichen, dem "eiteln, ohnmächtigen Vogel, der das schönste Gefieder hat und doch nicht fliegen kann," und es heißt zuletzt von ihm, er bilde "mit seinen schönen Federn ohne Schwungkraft, mit seinen schönen Versen ohne poetischen Flug, den Gegensatz zu jenem Adler des Gesanges, der minder glänzende Flügel hat, aber sich damit zur Sonne erhebt" Damit kann nur Goethe gemeint sein.

⁷Im Herbst 1830 schon befandete der Hamburger Freundeskreis des Dichters heftig "dieses portugiesische Ungeheuer" (Houben S. 173).

Italien Die Stadt Lucca Kap. VI.

Dieses Kapitel leiten ein die Verse 597-604 von Vossens Verdeutschung der *Ilias*, aber statt der Namen des Dichters oder des Übersetzers schreibt Heine unter die Verse kuhn und einfach "*Vulgata*" Die Kommentare lassen Sinn und Absicht dieser Sonderbarkeit unberedet Es scheint also bisher nicht verstanden zu sein, was die Unterschrift, was das Zitat selber ausdrücken soll.

Auf die Verse folgt unmittelbar jenes großartige, Dichtung wie Bildkunst noch nachgeborener Generationen werthun bestimmende Gemälde vom Christus im Olymp, das erstmals Heines weltanschauliche Leitidee eines ewigen Gegensatzes von Sensualismus und Spiritualismus, von Hellenentum und Nazarenertum ausspricht. Das Kapitel klingt aus in ein hymnisches Bekenntnis zum Leib, zum Sensualismus, zum Hellenismus. Die Bibel des Hellenismus aber ist Homer, und wie für die römisch-katholische Kirche die Bibelübersetzung des Hieronymus, so ist für den deutschen "Hellenen" Vossens deutscher Homer maßgebend—die "*Vulgata*"

Eine ähnliche Zusammenstellung Homers und der Bibel als der zwei "großen Bücher" findet sich in der *Denkschrift über Ludwig Borne* (Walzel VIII, S. 396), und in diesem Buche spricht Heine noch an anderer Stelle von der "*Ecclesia pressa*, die den Homeros als ihren Propheten verehrt" (S. 400). Beide Stellen aus dem eingelegten Helgolander Tagebuch von 1830, also auch zeitlich (entstehungsgeschichtlich) der *Stadt Lucca* nahestehend.

Auch in den *Erläuterungen zum Doktor Faust* (x, S. 70 f.) wird der gleiche Gedanke angeführt, dort, wo vom Geist der Renaissance die Rede ist "Die beiden großen Bücher der Menschheit, die sich vor einem Jahrtausend so feindlich befehdet und wie kampfmüde während dem ganzen Mittelalter vom Schauplatz zurückgezogen hatten, der Homer und die Bibel, treten zu Anfang des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts wieder öffentlich in die Schranken."

Und zum letztenmal begegnet die Antithese, diesmal mit der durch Heines "Konversion" zum Theismus bewirkten Umkehrung der Vorzeichen, wieder in den *Geständnissen* (Walzel x, S. 184) "ich, der ich ehemals den Homer zu zitieren pflegte, ich zitiere jetzt die Bibel."

Italien. Die Stadt Lucca. Kap. VII.

Die Kathedrale, in der Heine mit Francheska und Mathilde einer großen Messe beiwohnt, ist nach Karpeles und Elster (2IV, S. 551)

der Dom San Martino. Da nur für diese Szene Heines Widmungsverse *An August Lewald* (Walzel III, S. 454, vgl. S. 538) passen, ist Elsters Anmerkung a. a. O. S. 550, die das Gedichtlein auf Kap. VI und die Kirche San Michele bezieht, als offenkundiges Versehen zu streichen.

Die romantische Schule. Drittes Buch.

In der feinsinnigen, immer noch unveralteten Würdigung, die Heine dem bis heute verkannten Achim von Arnim gönnt (Walzel VII, S. 126), werden Tieck und die Schlegels verantwortlich gemacht für die Verdunkelung dieses großen deutschen Dichters, sie hatten ihn absichtlich ignoriert. "Nur nach seinem Tode," so schließt der erste Absatz des Arnim-Kapitels, "erhielt er eine Art Nekrolog von einem Mitglied der Schule"—Eine Anmerkung von Elsters erster Ausgabe (V, S. 317) verweist hier auf eine Arbeit des Wilibald Alexis im Berliner *Freimütigen* (1831, Nr. 25); das wird von Walzel kritiklos übernommen. Aber Haring-Alexis war niemals "Mitglied der Schule," kann demnach hier unmöglich gemeint sein. Wohl aber trifft solche Bezeichnung voll auf Gorres zu, der dem verewigten Freunde im Cottaschen *Literaturblatt* (Beilage zum Stuttgarter *Morgenblatt*) 1831, Nr. 27-30, einen herrlichen, Aufsehen erregenden Nachruf gehalten hat.

Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland.

Zweites Buch.

Hier ist gelegentlich die Rede von Hermann Franckes Stiftung des Halleschen Waisenhauses und dem dadurch bewirkten pietistischen Geiste dieser Universitätsstadt (Walzel VII, S. 273). "Halle," heißt es dann, "ist noch bis jetzt die Taupinière der Pietisten"—Elster (IV, S. 230) weiß mit dem seltsamen Fremdwort nicht viel anzufangen, er übersetzt es wortlich als "Maulwurfshugel," weist auf die Bedeutungserweiterung "schlechte Hütte" hin. Walzel, der merkt, daß das keinen rechten Sinn ergibt, mochte lieber an Verwechslung mit "Pepinière" (= Baumschule, Pflanzstätte, Seminar) denken; aber kann man im Ernst dem hochgebildeten und immer sorgfältigen Schriftsteller Heine solchen Lapsus zumuten? Viel näher liegt eine Deutung aus der Idiomatik des Parisischen. C. Villate (*Parisismen*, Berlin-Schöneberg, 1912, S. 367) wie R. Plate (*Wortkunde des modernen Französisch*, München

1933, S. 122) kennen ein Masculinum "taupin" zur Bezeichnung der Kandidaten für die (schwierige) *école polytechnique*, Villate auch ein umgangssprachliches Femininum "taupinière" für den "Kursus der höheren Mathematik als Vorbereitung zur Aufnahme in die polytechnische Schule." Danach treffen wir Sprach- und Spottsinn der Stelle wohl am besten mit solcher deutenden Übersetzung "Halle ist noch jetzt die *Presse* [nach H. Pauls *Deutschem Wörterbuch* verachtliche Bezeichnung für eine Anstalt zu schneller Vorbereitung auf eine Prüfung] der Pietisten."

Lutezia Erster Teil.

Im Nachtrag zum v. Stuck (Walzel ix, S. 44) staupt Heine den obskuren Musiker Josef Dessauer, der sich der fraglichen Gunst George Sands geruhmt hatte. Er nennt ihn "einen der miserabelsten Liederkompositoren vom mundfaulsten Dialekte"—Die Kommentatoren äußern sich über den Sinn des ungewöhnlichen Beiworts nicht, gerade darum ist zu vermuten, daß sie, wie die Mehrzahl der Leser, die Absicht des Autors nicht recht erfaßt haben. Zu solchem Ende muß man nämlich die deutlichere Parallelstelle des lvi. Stucks (Walzel ix, S. 286) heranziehen, wo von "seiner [Dessauers] kauderwalschen Mundart und einer gewissen naselnden Aussprache des Deutschen, die an faule Eier erinnert," die Rede ist. Ähnlich wird die Kölner "klassisch schlechte Aussprache der Deutschen" gescholten "eine Mundart, die wie faule Eier klingt, fast riecht" (Walzel x, S. 334). Das unappetitliche Bild begegnet schon in einer handschriftlichen Variante der *Reise von München nach Genua*, statt der schließlichen Fügung "ein ubelriechendes Lacheln spielte um den Mund" (Walzel iv, S. 230) wies das boshafte Maßmann-Portrait zuerst diese Verbreiterung auf. "... Mund, der, wenn er sich öffnete, und, mit einem Organ wie faule Eier, zu sprechen begann ..." (a. a. O. S. 469). Danach wäre jenes "mundfaul" also nicht von faul = trage abzuleiten, sondern von Mundfaule, hat den Sinn von "stinkig"⁸. Das paßt sehr gut zu Heines

⁸ Dieses böse Attribut spendet Heine auch sonst gerne der Mäuselrede. Etwa zum Schlusse von Stuck lvii der *Lutezia*, bei Schilderung der Gesellschaft um August Leo, einen in Paris lebenden getauften Juden "Es waren die holden Klänge der Muttersprache, sogar der Großmuttersprache, welche hier den Deutschen begrüßten. Hier ward die Mundart des Hamburger Dreckwalls am reinsten gesprochen, und wer diese klassischen Laute

allgemeiner Vorliebe und gehaufter Verwendung olfaktorischer Impressionen, Metaphern

Lutezia. Zweiter Teil.

Im Abschnitt LV bewahrt Heine seine treffliche Goethe-Kenntnis mit dem schließenden Vierzeiler (Walzel IX, S. 278), der den Alters-Wort- und Reimstil des Dichters glanzend parodiert, leider ist noch nicht herausgefunden, welche bestimmten Verse Goethes dabei vorschwebten. Ganzlich übersehen aber wurde bisher, daß im Kapitel LVII eine berühmte Prosastelle des von Heine allzeit hochgeschätzten Meisters als verstecktes Zitat verwertet wird. "Die Eisenbahnen," heißt es dort (a. a. O. S. 292), "sind ein providentielles Ereignis, das der Menschheit einen neuen Aufschwung gibt, das die Farbe und Gestalt des Lebens verändert, es beginnt ein neuer Abschnitt in der Weltgeschichte, und unsre Generation darf sich rühmen, daß sie dabei gewesen. "Selbstredend hat Heine kein Plagiat beabsichtigt, sondern durfte bei seinen gebildeten Lesern mit der fürs Verständnis der Anspielung nötigen Kenntnis des geflügelten Worts aus der "Kampagne in Frankreich" (anlaßlich der Kanonade von Valmy) rechnen. "Von hier und heute geht eine neue Epoche der Weltgeschichte aus und ihr könnt sagen, ihr seid dabei gewesen" (Jubilaums-Ausgabe XXVIII, S. 60).

Ähnliches liegt an einer Stelle der *Geständnisse* vor (Walzel X, S. 203), wo der Dichter mit dem Tagtraum scherzt, was wohl alles aus ihm hatte werden können, wenn seine Mutter, freundschaftlichem Rate folgend, ihn der katholischen Priesterlaufbahn zugeführt hatte. er wäre ein galanter romischer Abbat geworden, "hatte ganz das Zeug dazu gehabt, . . . im süßesten dolce far niente dahin zu schlendern durch die Bibliotheken, Galerien, Kirchen und Ruinen der ewigen Stadt, studierend im Genusse und genießend im *Studium*. . ." — Ohne Frage schwebt hier die v. der *Römischen Elegien* vor, insbesondere die allbekannten Verse:

Und belehr ich mich nicht, indem ich des lieblichen Busens
Formen spähe, die Hand leite die Hüften hinab?
Dann versteh ich den Marmor erst recht ich denk und vergleiche
Sehe mit fühlendem Aug, fühle mit sehender Hand

vernahm, dem ward zumute, als röche er wieder die Twieten des Monkedamms" (IX, S. 302)

Heines Schriften sind voll von solchen stillschweigenden Zitierungen, deren die Kommentare nur in seltenen Fällen gedenken, so spielt z. B. in der "Retrospektiven Aufklärung" des zweiten Teils der *Lutezia* bei Schilderung von Godoy's "umfangreicher kurfürstlicher Purpurnase" (Walzel ix, S. 318) das zweite Beiwort auf Eichendorffs *Aus dem Leben eines Taugenichts* an, wo bekanntlich ein stattlicher Portier mit "einer außerordentlich langen, gebogenen, kurfürstlichen Nase" (A. v. Grolman's Ausgabe II, S. 365, Z. 6 v. u.) auftritt (Die Taugenichtsnovelle hatte Heine gleich nach Erscheinen gelesen, vgl. H. Bieber, *Heines Gespräche*, Berlin, 1926, S. 77)

Gedanken und Einfälle.

Hier heißt es an einer Stelle vom Bürgerkönig Louis Philippe (Walzel x, S. 278) "Unter ihm herrschte Glück und Freiheit—er war der Roi d'Yvetot der Freiheit."—Dazu merkt Elster an (vii, S. 438) "Yvetot, kleine französische Stadt, König von Yvetot = kleiner Herr, der seinem Vergnügen lebt, Duodezfürst." Mit dieser, offenbar dem *Larousse* entnommenen Note (die Leitzmann a. a. O. S. 427 unbesehen übernimmt) ist das Verständnis der dunklen Anspielung gewiß nicht erreicht. Heines Zeitgenossen, mindestens die mit französischer Literatur vertrauten, werden ihn aber ohneweiters verstanden haben, denn sein Gleichnis ist einem der bekanntesten Gedichte Bérangers entnommen, *Le Roi d'Yvetot* betitelt und vom Mai 1813 datiert, das in der Gesamtausgabe die Reihe der Chansons eröffnet. Es weist und preist einen idyllischen Lustspielmonarchen, der lebt und leben läßt, seine Macht und Würde in keiner Weise mißbraucht, aber gerade ob so unruhmliehen Herrschens sich allgemeiner Liebe erfreut. Der bezeichnende Refrain lautet:

Quel bon petit roi c'était là !

Ein solcher *bon petit roi* der Freiheit, meint Heine, war Louis Philippe.

JOSEF KORNER

Prag

A OR BATU A PROBLEM IN LEXICOLOGY

A or batu is a frequently recurring expression in Old French; it has its counterpart, *ab aur batut*, in Provençal and gave rise in Middle English to the terms *gold y-bete*¹ and *gold y-batrūd*.² Neither the meaning of *a or batu* nor its origin, however, has yet been satisfactorily explained.

Godefroy gives in the supplement to his *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française* under the word *batre*

Or batu, or martelé et réduit en fil, par altérat, la loc *a or batu*, qui signifiait (orné) avec de l'or battu, est devenue une expression adjectivale qui a pris l'accord du substantif auquel elle se rapportait et s'est même transformée en *batu à* (ou *en*) *or*

At first sight this explanation seems adequate, and it has been accepted by a number of scholars. Careful analysis, however, will show that it must be rejected.

The circumstances noted by Godefroy concerning the agreement of *batu*, not with *or* but with the substantive modified by the entire phrase, is a constant one, there being very few cases of a contrary observance. To illustrate, let me cite three passages from *Le Conte de Poitiers*.³

932	. un cercle a or batu
954	dras de soie a or batus
1440	Adont osterent les çaintures, Qui estoient a or batues

Now if, as Godefroy's interpretation supposes, *batu* were originally the attribute of *or*, this mode of agreement could be accounted for only on the assumption that the elements of *a or batu* had fused and lost their identity so that the group was felt as a single word. The nature of the components of *a or batu* makes unlikely any such fusion in the first place, but let us grant its possibility: the group could not then have undergone the shift in the order of its elements

¹ See O. F. Emerson, "Some Notes on Chaucer and Some Conjectures," *Philological Quarterly*, II (1923), 85-90 (reprinted in the Emerson memorial volume, *Chaucer Essays and Studies* [Western Reserve University Press, 1929], pp. 384-92)

² *Sir Ferumbras* (ed. S. J. Herrtage, London, 1879), vs. 896

³ Ed. V. F. Koenig, Paris, 1937

which Godefroy supposes in attempting to account for the alternative form *batu a or*.

As a matter of fact, *batu a or* is not a later development, but the primitive and natural order of the phrase. It is the earliest form in which the expression is found in French ⁴

433

Tot la guige en fu batue a or .

*Chanson de Willame*⁵

Examination of some 200 passages shows beyond doubt that *a or batu* is a poetic word order brought about to produce a rime or assonance in *u*, in prose or in the interior of a verse the order *batu a or* generally prevails.⁶ Transposition of a past participle in this wise is not at all infrequent in Old French verse, in fact, one may cite a number of closely analogous expressions which show clearly the function of *batu* in our group. Thus *a or gemet* (*Roland*, 1995), *a or brosdé* (*R de Troie*, II, 1143), *a or goté* (*ibid*, 1231), *a or tissu* (*Perceval*, 9178), *a or bendé* (*Joufroi*, 408), *et al.* In none of these is there the slightest question of the past participle's ever having stood in direct junction with *or*.

In the phrase *a or batu*, then, *batu* does not and did not originally indicate the state of the gold, but rather the manner in which it was fixed upon the object in question. The fact that *or batu*, when these two words formed a junction, might mean gold leaf or gold thread has no particular bearing on our case, and there is in *a or*

⁴ In Provençal, however, there is a somewhat earlier example of the other order in the *Chanson de sainte Foi d'Agen* (ed A Thomas, Paris, 1925):

369

D'un pah q'es ab aur batuz

It may be pointed out here that this verse corresponds roughly to vs 131 of the *Passio metrica sanctorum Fidis et Caprasii* (source of the *Chanson* and published in vol II of the Hoepffner-Alfaric edition [Strasbourg, 1927])

Vestem vestitem gemmis auroque politam

The Latin version, however, is of no assistance in assigning a meaning to our phrase because, in the first place, the *Chanson* very obviously does not give a faithful rendition of the *Passio* and, secondly, the sense of the Latin past participle—something like “adorned, resplendent”—is too vague to afford the precision we are seeking concerning *batuz*

⁵ Ed. E S Tyler, New York, 1919

⁶ The few exceptions to this statement are doubtless to be ascribed to the influence of the frequently occurring poetic order

batu no explicit indication that the gold involved was in the form of either thread or leaf. What we are really concerned with here is a hitherto neglected meaning of the verb *batre*, which might, when used in connection with gold, signify the ornamental fixation or application of that metal, in some yet to be determined manner, upon objects. *Batre* is to be found in this sense in its active forms as well as in the past participle

A Gautier de Laon, sellier pour battre 14 aunes de cendal des armes
nostre sire le Roy

Geoffroi de Fleuri, *Compte pour les six derniers mois de l'année 1316*, p. 17⁷

From the example just cited it will be noted that *batre* need not be accompanied by the subjunct phrase *a or* in order to have the meaning "ornament with gold". In fact, *batre* frequently occurs in this sense thus unaccompanied. In such cases, however, *a or* appears to remain always implied, there is no evidence that *batre* was ever used in French to express ornamentation with metals or materials other than gold.⁸

Our next step is to determine, if possible, the exact nature of the application or fixation of gold expressed by *batre*. Godefroy, we have seen, believed *a or batu* denoted ornamentation with gold thread, hence embroidery or interweaving.⁹ Now, in spite of the

⁷ In Douet d'Arcq, *Comptes de l'Argenterie des rois de France* (Paris, 1851)

⁸ An example given in Levy's *Supplement Worterbuch* seems to indicate that the verb had greater extension than this in Provençal

342 Marmes luzens, pertratz en aut,
Jent batutz d'azur e d'esmaut

La Pacions de san Porcari, vi

⁹ With Godefroy's remarks as a point of departure, Emerson (*op cit*) arrived at the meanings "woven, adorned, embroidered, trimmed" for *ME. beten*, Constans, in his glossary to the *R de Troie* (SDAT, 1904-12), translates *pailes a or batues* as "pièces de soie tissues d'or", Jenkins in his edition of the *Roland* (Boston, 1929) glosses *batu a or* as "ornamented with gold (thread)", F. Bonnardot in the glossary to the *Miracles de Notre Dame par personnages* (SDAT, 1893) gives "broché d'or"; Miss E. R. Goddard in her work on *Women's Costume in French Texts of the 11th and 12th Centuries* (Baltimore, 1927) associates *a or batu* with *orfrois*, that is, gold lace or braid, Fr Michel (*Recherches sur le commerce, la fabrication et l'usage des étoffes de soie, d'argent et d'or en Occident* [Paris, 1852-4], II, 389) believed *a or batu* to indicate gold embroidery but supposed *batu* to mean that the threads had been flattened by beating in

fact that he arrived at this conception through a misunderstanding of the relationship of *batu* to *or*, it is still possible that in substance he was right, that is, the meaning of *batre* which we are seeking to determine more precisely may have been "embroider" or "interweave" And, indeed, ground for the belief that this was the fact is to be found in the circumstance that *batre a or* was generally employed in reference to textile materials. We should not, therefore, be justified in dismissing the notion of gold thread before having examined it further.

The possibility that *batre a or* denoted interweaving may be dismissed immediately if we recall the passage we have already cited from the accounts of Geoffroi de Fleuri.

. . . pour batie 14 aunes de cendal des armes nostre sire le Roy

Is this not evidence that, whatever the process expressed by *batre*, it was practised on finished cloth, a circumstance which excludes interweaving? Any doubt on this score must be banished by another passage of the same import from the same source ¹⁰

Item, pour 35 onces de cendaus indes, que l'en bati dessus des armes de France. . .

Here the presence of *dessus* shows plainly that the ornamentation must have been on the surface of the fabric.¹¹

It may be somewhat difficult to see by just what semantic processes *batre* might have come to mean "embroider,"¹² but one can hardly fail to grant the possibility of its having developed such a meaning. But then there is encountered this further and more serious difficulty if *batre* did have the meaning "embroider," why

order to expose a greater surface of gold Under *battu* Littré gives "brocart battu d'or, brocart dans lequel il entre beaucoup d'or", this has been copied by some lesser dictionaries, but the term appears not to be current in modern French Littré doubtless derived his definition from Old French examples

¹⁰ Douet-d'Arceq, *op cit*, p 19

¹¹ Still another example bearing this out is to be found in Joinville, *Histoire de saint Louis* (ed N. de Wailly, Paris, 1874), § 94 "plentei de sergans vestus des armes au conte de Portiers batues sur cendal"

¹² Emerson, *op cit*, p 87, notwithstanding; the cases of *braid* and *weave* cannot be considered as analogous to that of *batre*, since the latter in its proper sense does not suggest the kind of movement involved in embroidery.

216. Item, en un coffre de cuir, un parement à cheval, de veloux asuré semé de broderie en façon de genestes et trois grans fleurs de lis d'or de broderie

220 Item, une couverture à cheval de satin asuré, toute entière doublée de toille à grans fleurs de liz de bateure

262 Item, XI tant pannonns que bannières, sur cendal, d'ouvraige de bateure, aux armes de France

263 Item, une jacquete de veloux asuré, de vieille façon, toute semée de fleurs de lis de broderie, pourfilée de menues perles

Patently *bateure* is here used to express the kind of ornamentation resulting from the process indicated by *batre*.

This last circumstance furnishes a clue to the real meaning of *batre a or*, for, although the verb *battre* lost the sense of "ornament with gold" sometime in the course of the sixteenth century,¹⁷ the corresponding noun *batture* may still be used to indicate a kind of gilding. Littré defines this word "Espèce de dorure, dont l'assiette se fait avec du miel détrempé dans de l'eau de colle et du vinaigre." The *Dictionnaire général* of Hatzfeld, Darmesteter and Thomas gives under *batture* "Mélange de miel, de vinaigre et d'eau de colle, et quelquefois d'autres substances, qu'on étend, dans certains genres de dorures, sur les parties qui doivent ensuite recevoir l'or. *Par ext.* Le genre de dorure où l'on emploie ce procédé." It now seems hardly possible to doubt that *batre a or* signified the application of gold to an object by means of an adherent mixture (size). This process, let it be noted, could be used in connection with textiles as well as with nonfabric material.¹⁸

We have yet to consider the origin of our expression. If the compilers of the *Dictionnaire général* are correct in viewing *batture* as a term first applied to size—doubtless because of the action of mixing it (cf. English *batter*)—and then extended to the type of gilding in which size is employed, the verb *batre* may readily have lent itself to expressing the fixation of gold by means of size (*bateure*). However, the interpretation of the *Dictionnaire général* is by no means certain. *Batre* in the sense of "ornament with

¹⁷ The passage from Rabelais cited above is the most recent instance of the use of *battre* in this sense that I have been able to find. Huguet does not list this meaning for *battre* in his *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle* (Paris, 1925—), nor does it appear in the dictionaries of Palsgrave and Cottgrave.

¹⁸ When used in connection with fabrics, the process is, I believe, called "tinsel-printing" in English.

gold" is encountered long before *bateure* may be found in a corresponding sense. And no known example of *bateure* meaning "size" antedates those in which we first find the word meaning "gilding." Moreover, *batture* was never a general term for mixture, but has this sense only in connection with gilding.¹⁹ These considerations lead one to seek a more satisfactory explanation of the matter.

The process signified by *bate a or* consisted of pressing gold leaf upon a surface prepared with size in order to form a figure or design. *Batre* may hence be thought of as having had in our expression the meaning "stamp, impress a figure upon." Now this meaning is quite appropriate to *batre*, it had it in the expression *batre monnaie*,²⁰ "strike coin." It may be remarked that wherever *batre a or* is accompanied by an indication of the character of the design, the figures are of the same type as might appear on coins—insignia, fleurs-de-lis, stars, heraldic animals, etc. It seems, then, that the use of *batre* in *batre a or* is related to its use in *batre monnaie*, indeed the use in *bate a or* may be simply an extension of that in *batre monnaie*.²¹

V. FREDERIC KOENIG

The University of Arizona

¹⁹ English *batter* is a post-verbal, it does not derive from *batture*.

²⁰ *Batre* has, of course, been replaced by *frapper* in this sense.

²¹ La Curne de Ste-Pelaye gives under *battre* a definition which seems to fit in well with our conclusions "Vestemens battus en or, vêtements sur lesquels il y avait de l'or appliqué ou imprimé." Numerous examples of *a or batu* are included in the Tobler-Lommatzsch *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, but no attempt is made to define the term. J. Salverda de Grave in the glossary to *Enéas* gives for *batu a or* "couvert de feuilles d'or." Douet d'Arceq affirms (*Comptes de l'Argenterie*, p. xxiii) "Ce qu'on appelle du cendal battu était l'étoffe sur laquelle on avait appliqué de minces feuilles de métal, ou ou argent, découpées en diverses figures." La Borde in his *Notice des émaux, bijoux, etc. du Louvre* (Paris, 1853), includes in his glossary *bateure*, which he defines "Métal battu, réduit en feuilles minces, qu'on emploie en découpages sur les étoffes et en dorure sur les matières solides, ou bien étiré et aplati, puis enroulé sur un fil de soie, avec lequel on brode des étoffes." This definition seems to have influenced both Godefroy and Littré, it is given verbatim by von Wartburg, who doubtless took it from Godefroy. A. Thomas gives for the *ab aur batut* of the *Chanson de sainte Foi* "rehaussé par l'application d'or." Hoepffner in his edition renders it by "lamé d'or," thereby following Paul Meyer who translates the term thus in his second edition of the *Flamenca*. Crescim in his *Manualetto provenzale* evades the issue by giving simply "lavorato ad oro."

HENRY HARLAND, AN AMERICAN FORERUNNER OF
PROUST

It may seem excessively literal to consider as an American one who was, according to his own story, born in St Petersburg, brought up in Rome, educated in Paris, and who, after practising the literary profession in London, died at San Remo on the Italian Riviera. To make the legend complete, Henry Harland vainly regarded himself as heir to the baronetcy of Harland of Sproughton, County Suffolk. The *DNB.* and the *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography* notwithstanding, it is far more likely that he was born in New York, and certainly he was educated almost entirely here before his entrance into the surrogate's office in New York City.¹ No one contests the fact that his father was a lawyer of Norwich, Connecticut. Almost totally unknown today in his own country, despite the immense popularity of *The Cardinal's Snuff-Box* at the turn of the century (which alone made for him \$75,000), he may be better remembered in England, as the editor of *The Yellow Book* during that periodical's brief and colorful life.

It is, if anything, less fanciful to call him a forerunner of Marcel Proust, though Proust probably never read a line by this now forgotten novelist who died eight years before *A la recherche du temps perdu* began to appear in 1913. Proust's fundamental originality remains unquestioned even today when criticism is beginning to show a less cordial attitude toward the creator of the Guermantes and the Verdurins, of Swann and Charlus. To be sure, his superficial debt to Saint-Simon and the influence that Bergson's theory of time exerted upon him were early recognized. But the very basis of his work, as it became apparent when *Le Temps retrouvé* was posthumously published, is the distinction between the voluntary and the involuntary memory. Proust himself established this fact not only in the last volume of his great work but repeatedly in his correspondence, always insisting that no such distinction is to be found in Bergson. Very likely he was ignorant of the fact that his magic link between the present and the past had been studied by such psychologists as Ribot and Paulhan as early as 1896 and even perceived twenty years earlier by Taine as a phenomenon worthy of study.

¹ See Albert Parry, "Henry Harland. Expatriate," *The Bookman*, LXXVI (1933), 1-10.

Marcel Proust made his discovery quite independently when upon tasting by chance one day a little biscuit dipped in tea he felt himself suddenly carried back to his childhood. In one instant the past was suppressed and he stood, a little boy, beside his grandmother's bed in the very atmosphere of her room as it had not existed since her death many years before. His emotions were precisely those of that day in the otherwise dim past when he had first tasted such a *madeleine* soaked in tea. After a series of such almost mystical experiences, in each of which one of the most significant moments of his childhood or youth was called back to life by some slight sensory perception, Proust formulated a theory. According to him, memory, instead of a carbon copy of the various facts of our life ever ready for reference, is rather an abyss whence the fortuitous repetition of a sensation draws forth fully resuscitated recollections. The identity of sensations releases a spring and permits the past to well up within us. The magic key may be the taste of a tea-drenched biscuit, the clink of a spoon against a saucer, the feeling of an uneven pair of paving blocks underfoot, the touch of a newly starched napkin against one's lips (to take Proust's examples), or any similarly slight stimulus which will obviously be personal to each of us. Rarely does the impulse come through the visual sense; it would seem that the other four senses, about which we have romanticized less, possess a greater revivifying force.

Mais qu'un bruit, qu'une odeur, déjà entendu et respirée jadis le soient de nouveau, à la fois dans le présent et dans le passé, réels sans être actuels, idéaux sans être abstraits, aussitôt l'essence permanente et habituellement cachée des choses se trouve libérée et notre vie moi qui parfois depuis longtemps, semblait morte, mais ne l'était pas autrement, s'éveille, s'anime en recevant la céleste nourriture qui lui est apportée.²

When Proust had proceeded this far and noticed in addition that his most vivid aesthetic impressions always came to him immediately after such sensations, he decided, as he tells us in his last volume, to make his great literary work turn upon such renewals of the past with their power of canceling the effects of time.

That Marcel Proust was particularly susceptible to such automatic evocations of the past not even the psychologists who have most studied this emotional phenomenon would deny. He had the further advantage of spending the last third of his life as an invalid cloistered in a chamber whose now famous cork-lining protected

² *Le Temps retrouvé*, II, 16.

him from the present. There he could mull over the past, when he had really lived, and elaborately recreate it in the slow-moving prose of one for whom time, in the ordinary sense, no longer counted. The result was a masterpiece of a type the world had never known.

But Henry Harland's work, in all its lamentable mediocrity, bears witness to a similar sensitivity to involuntary transpositions in time.⁸ One must not look for that aspect of his personality in the novels published late in his career when he was carried away by admiration for that other American exile, Henry James. *The Cardinal's Snuff-Box*, *The Lady Paramount*, *My Friend Prospero*, and *The Royal End* are laid in the perfumed bosom of a cosmopolitan society whose artificiality would have made Ouida blush. The Lombard castles, Tuscan villas, and English estates where John Blanchemain, of the oldest English aristocracy, falls in love with Maria-Dolores von Zelt-Neuminster, in which Susanna, Contessa de Sampaolo, woos her handsome cousin Lord Craford or the American heiress Ruth Lydgate spurns a morganatic marriage with Bertram Bertrandoni, King of Altronde, to succumb to the charms of the noble Harry Pontycroft have a sameness that makes them indistinguishable. These romances contain no spontaneous recall of reality. But the short stories written during the nineties in London and some of the early novels of the American period signed with the pseudonym Sidney Luska obviously bear a closer relation to the author's experience.

Two of the stories included in *Comedies and Errors* (1898) are wholly concerned with relating experiences of the subconscious memory. "Rooms" opens with this sentence pronounced by a waiter in a café on the Rouen waterfront. "Would Madame like a little orange-flower water in her milk?" The moment the order is served a spell is cast over the narrator:

It was partly, I daresay, the sight of the dark-blue bottle, but it was chiefly, perhaps, the smell of the orange-flower water, that suddenly, suddenly, whisked my thoughts far away from Rouen, far away from 1897, back ten, twenty, I would rather not count how many years back in the past, to my childhood, to Saint-Graal, and to my grandmother's room in our

⁸For other precursors of Proust in this regard, see my study, "La Mémoire involontaire avant Marcel Proust," *Revue de Littérature Comparée*, janvier-mars 1939, pp 19-36. I wish to express my gratitude to my colleague William York Tindall for originally calling my attention to Harland.

rambling house there For my grandmother always kept a dark blue bottle of orange-flower water in her closet, and the air of the room was always faintly sweet with the perfume of it

Suddenly, suddenly, a sort of ghost of my grandmother's room rose before me, and as I peered into it and about it, a ghost of the old emotion her room used to stir in me rose too, an echo of the old wonder, the old feeling of strangeness and mystery It was a big room—or, at least, it seemed big to a child—a corner room, on the first floor, with windows on two sides ⁴

Then he describes in detail not only that room but also his uncle Edmond's room and his mother's in the same house. Finally his companion interrupts his reverie by asking if it isn't time they paid the waiter and were off. And so ends "Rooms." As in the case of Proust's first recorded encounter with the involuntary memory, the original emotion, the grandmother, her room and indeed the whole house unfold from an otherwise insignificant perception on the part of one of the senses,—just like those elaborate and colorful flowers (the comparison is Proust's), invented by the Japanese, which blossom from a bit of paper dropped into a glass of water.

The other story, "Tirala-Tirala . . .," is even more Proustian, for Harland assumes a more inquisitive attitude here and we find him even renewing the charm as Marcel Proust was to do. In fact "Tirala-Tirala . . ." begins with a question.

I wonder what the secret of it is—why that little fragment of a musical phrase has always had this instant, irresistible power to move me The tune of which it formed a part I have never heard. . . As when I was a child, so now, after all these years, it is a sort of talisman in my hands, a thing to conjure with

I remember quite clearly the day when I first heard it, quite clearly, though it was more—oh, more than five-and-twenty years ago, and the days that went before and came after it have entirely lost their outlines, and merged into a vague golden blur.⁵

One rainy afternoon during his childhood (even now he can shut his eyes for a moment and "the flavour of that far-away afternoon comes back fresher in my memory than yesterday's") he found in a family store-room an ancient dressing-case containing a tiny music-box in the center. He turned the gilded key and—

The cylinder began to turn—but alas, in silence, or almost in silence, emitting only a faintly audible, rusty gr-r-r-r, a sort of guttural grumble, until, all at once, when I was least expecting it—tirala-tirala—it trilled

⁴ *Comedies and Errors*, London, John Lane, 1922, pp 213-214.

⁵ *Ibid*, p. 97.

out clearly, crisply, six silvery notes, and then relapsed into its rusty gr-r-r-r. I dare say, for another, any six notes, struck at haphazard, would signify as much. But for me—ah, if I could seize the sentiment it has for me and translate it into English words, I should have achieved a sort of miracle. For me, it is the voice of a spirit, sighing something unutterable. It is my wishing-cap, my magic carpet, my key to the Castle of Enchantment.

When I was a child the Castle of Enchantment meant—the Future, the great mysterious Future, away, away there, beneath the uttermost horizon, where the sky is luminous with tints of rose and pearl, the ineffable Future when I should be grown-up.

Well, I am grown-up now, and I have seen something of the great world—something of its gold and marble, its cavalcading knights and beautiful princesses. But if I care to dream desirous dreams, I touch my talisman, and wish myself back in the little world of my childhood. Tirala-tirala—I breathe it softly, softly, and the sentiment of my childhood comes and fills my room like a fragrance. I am at Saint-Graal again, and my grandmother is seated at her window, knitting, and André is bringing up the milk from the farm, and my cousin Elodie is playing her exercises on the piano, and Hélène and I are walking in the garden—Hélène in her short white frock, with a red sash, and her black hair loose down her back. All round us grow innumerable flowers, and innumerable birds are singing in the air, and the frogs are croaking, croaking in our pond. It is not much, perhaps it is not very wonderful, but oh, how my heart yearns to recover it, how it aches to realize that it never can.*

Besides the affective memory, as psychologists call it, carried to a point where it is recognized and artificially provoked by means of the banal musical fragment, we find here another discovery which Proust has emphasized. For he too saw that what once evoked the future can later come to evoke the past, while the emotion remains the same. Thus the little phrase from Vinteuil's sonata, which had originally introduced into Swann's life a new concept of beauty, came eventually to symbolize his love for Odette and to make him relive, every time he heard it played, the period in which he still loved her, with all the joys and all the sorrows he then felt.

Another story, "When I am King," published in *Grey Roses* in 1895, rests on a similar evocation through music. The narrator, spending the night in a French port town, drops into a cheap dance hall where an old pianist is playing for sailors to dance.

A dance had ended, and after a breathing spell he began to play an interlude. It was an instance of how tunes, like perfumes, have the power to wake sleeping memories. The tune he was playing now, simple and dreamy

* *Ibid.*, pp 104-109

like a lullaby, and strangely at variance with the surroundings, whisked me off in a twinkling, far from the actual—ten, fifteen years backwards—to my student life in Paris, and set me to thinking, as I had not thought for many a long day, of my hero, friend, and comrade, Edmund Pair, for it was a tune of Pair's composition, a melody he had written to a nursery rhyme, and used to sing a good deal, half in fun, half in earnest, to his lady-love, Godelinette. It was as if fifteen years were erased from my life. The face of Godelinette was palpable before me—pale, with its sad little smile, its bright appealing eyes. Edmund might have been smoking across the table—I could hear his voice, I could have put out my hand and touched him. And all around me were the streets, the lights, the smells, the busy youthful *va-et-vient* of the Latin Quarter.⁷

Of course he finds that the old pianist is his friend Pair who had never met success. In *Du côté de chez Swann* the image of the waking memories finds fuller development.

Et avant que Swann eût eu le temps de comprendre, et de se dire "C'est la petite phrase de la sonate de Vinteuil, n'écoutons pas!" tous ses souvenirs du temps où Odette était éprise de lui, et qu'il avait réussi jusqu'à ce jour à maintenir invisibles dans les profondeurs de son être, trompés par ce brusque rayon du temps d'amour qu'ils avaient revu, s'étaient réveillés, et à tire d'aile, étaient remontés lui chanter éperdument, sans pitié pour son infortune présente, les refrains oubliés du bonheur.⁸

Like the French writer, Henry Harland was especially susceptible to music. In his first novel, *As It was Written*, published in New York in 1885, an example of the involuntary memory stands combined with the very Proustian theme of the lover who chooses a certain musical phrase as a symbol of the beloved. Within the first pages of the novel, the young violinist Ernest Neuman tells how, unable to describe his fiancée Veronika in words, he could easily express his idea of her by playing "this heavenly melody from Chopin's Impromptu in C-sharp minor," and he gives the musical notation.⁹ Two hundred pages later, long after Veronika's untimely death on the eve of their marriage, Ernest is playing his violin one day with a wild frenzy, playing anything that comes to his mind, losing himself in his music. . .

Then I heard the passionate wail of Chopin become predominant. the exquisite melody of the *Berceuse*, motives from *Les Polonaises*, and at length the impromptu in C-sharp minor—that to which I have alluded in

⁷ *Grey Roses*, London, John Lane, 1902, pp 137-147

⁸ *Du côté de chez Swann*, II, 183-184

⁹ *As It was Written*, New York, Cassell and Company, 1885, p 21.

the early part of this narrative, as descriptive of Veronika. Following it, came the songs that Veronika herself had been most prone to sing, Bizet, Pergolese, Schumann, morsels of German folk *lieder*, old French romances. And ever and anon that phrase from the impromptu kept recurring. Everything else seemed to lead up to it. It terminated a brilliant passage by Liszt. It cropped out in the middle of a theme from the *Meistersinger*. And with its every recurrence, the picture of Veronika which it presented to my imagination grew more life-like and palpable, until ere long it was almost as though I saw her standing near me in substantial objective form.¹⁰

In Proust's first published volume, that youthful work which appeared in Paris in 1896 and contained so many of the themes he was later to orchestrate in *A la recherche du temps perdu*, there is a striking parallel to this scene. After fleeing Paris for fear that she might betray her unexpressed love for a man she hardly knew, Madame de Breyves shuts herself up in a room at the seaside and plays over and over a few bars from the *Meistersinger*, in which, because of having heard them once in his presence, she has embodied her love for M. de Laléande.¹¹ There is no need to point out the resemblance between this unhappy lady and Swann.

As It was Written contains another brief allusion to its author's sensitivity to the memory of the senses, but this time it is the sense of smell that possesses the magic power. Because Ernest used to cross the Hudson every week with Veronika and really came to know and to love her on those ferryings, he says

The hoboken ferry-boats became to my thinking vastly more interesting than the most romantic of Venetian gondolas; and to this day I cannot sniff the peculiar stuffy odor that always pervades a ferry-boat cabin without being transported back across the years to that happy, happy time.¹²

Again, in *The Yoke of the Torah*, published in New York in 1887, we see the hero Elias Bacharach finding among some "miscellaneous odds and ends" a little gold pencil that he had thought lost six years ago, soon after he had received it from a New Orleans aunt for his twenty-first birthday.

Holding it in his hand, and examining it a little before putting it into his pocket and going on with his work, Elias felt himself suddenly carried backward, for an instant, to the period with which it was associated

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 227-228

¹¹ *Les Plaisirs et les jours*, Paris, Gallimard, 1924, p. 126

¹² *As It was Written*, p. 26.

Talismanic pencil, that had power to raise the dead, and annihilate the intervening years! There it lay, in shape, weight, color, in length, breadth, thickness, in all its attributes and dimensions, precisely the same as on that far-off birthday morning, when his mother, to whose care his aunt had entrusted it, delivered it to him, neatly boxed up in pasteboard, wrapped in tissue-paper, and sealed with red sealing-wax. How well he remembered! It might have been last week. It might almost have been yesterday. And yet, how much, indeed how much, had happened since. How well he remembered, thanks to this little pencil, precisely the same now as then, quite unchanged.¹³

That, on the other hand, Harland shared Proust's scorn for the voluntary, or ordinary, form of memory and the poverty of its results is apparent from a passage in the story "Castles near Spain," which appeared in *Grey Roses*:

He went on to his journey's end, stopped before the great gilded grille, with its multiplicity of scrolls and flourishes, its coronets and interlaced initials, gazed up the shadowy aisles of plane-trees to the bit of castle gleaming in the sun at the end, remembered the child Hélène, and how he and she had loved each other there, a hundred years ago, and thought of the exiled, worse than widowed woman immured there now but it was mere remembering, mere thinking, it was mere cerebration. The emotion he had looked for did not come.¹⁴

Henry Harland could have subscribed unhesitatingly to this statement from the early pages of *Du côté de chez Swann*:

Il en est ainsi de notre passé. C'est peine perdue que nous cherchions à l'évoquer, tous les efforts de notre intelligence sont inutiles. Il est caché hors de son domaine et de sa portée, en quelque objet matériel (en la sensation que nous donnerait cet objet matériel), que nous ne soupçonnons pas. Cet objet, il dépend du hasard que nous le rencontrions avant de mourir, ou que nous ne le rencontrions pas.¹⁵

Marcel Proust might not have been pleased had he been told that his discovery of what he himself considered as the basis of all his work had been foreshadowed to some extent by a far from first rate writer ten years his senior. Though Henry Harland's total work is less voluminous than Proust's, it contains just as many of these mysterious renewals of the past. In fact, more than any other writer except Baudelaire, in whom Proust recognized a special

¹³ *The Yoke of the Thorah*, New York, Cassell and Company, 1887, pp 120-122

¹⁴ *Grey Roses*, p 186

¹⁵ *Du côté de chez Swann*, I, 69

affinity on this score, Harland shared Proust's peculiar sensitivity to the workings of the involuntary memory. Yet the distance between Harland and Proust remains very great. The former could not be said to have discovered the affective memory since he never fully analyzed his emotions or attempted to put them to the fullest use artistically. It is in just this that Proust's originality lies. He *consciously* explained and utilized a series of *subconscious* experiences.

Toward the end of his vast work, Proust pictures himself some years earlier as on the point of beginning it. While waiting for the end of a musical composition before entering the drawing-room of the Princesse de Guermantes, née Verdurin, he reflects on the insistence with which moments of the past have risen to the surface of late. Then it is that he decides his mission will be to resurrect the unknown past in all its vividness and thus to conquer the ravages of time. He writes in *Le Temps retrouvé*:

Je ne pouvais nier, que vraiment, en ce qui me concernait, quand des impressions vraiment esthétiques m'étaient venues, ç'avait toujours été à la suite de sensations de ce genre. Et déjà je pouvais dire que si c'était chez moi, par l'importance exclusive qu'il prenait, un trait qui m'était personnel, cependant j'étais rassuré en découvrant qu'il s'apparentait à des traits moins marqués, mais reconnaissables, discernables, et au fond assez analogues chez certains écrivains.¹⁵

Those writers whom he recognizes as having vaguely sensed the possibility of recapturing the past are Chateaubriand, Gérard de Nerval and Baudelaire. And on the threshold of his great undertaking he felt encouraged to find himself placed in what he calls "une filiation aussi noble." Had he known that the relatively obscure American, Henry Harland, had approached even closer to his own discovery, he would have had the assurance, let us hope, not to doubt the nobility of his artistic ancestry.

JUSTIN O'BRIEN

Columbia University

¹⁵ *Le Temps retrouvé*, II, 81-82.

SMOLLETT, EDITOR OF VOLTAIRE

The creator of Truncheon and Lismahago was a painstaking and hard-working man with some pretention to erudition who fully deserved to be called "the learned Dr. Smollett." His versatility was unquestioned and for a time he was as well known for his *History of England*, his translations of *Gil Blas* and *Don Quixote*, his editorship of the *Critical Review* and the *British Magazine* as for *Roderick Random* and *Peregrine Pickle*. It seems natural, therefore, to find him, in 1761, becoming joint editor, along with Thomas Francklin, of a complete English translation of Voltane's *Works*¹

We have little exact information on the extent of the work undertaken by the editors. Francklin's contribution seems to have been confined mainly to the translation of Voltaire's dramatic works. the volumes containing these are ascribed on the title-pages to him alone.² Smollett's share, as he himself tells us in his

¹ *The Works of Mr de Voltaire Translated from the French With notes historical and critical By Dr Smollet and others Printed for J Newbery, R Baldwin, etc London, 1761 (-1769) Vol I (-xxxvi)* Actually vols 1-35 were published in 1761-65, which should count as the dates of the edition, but an extra volume was added in 1769. A later edition, 1778-1781, contained 38 vols and was augmented later to include Voltaire's remaining works and a *Life* by Condorcet taken from the Kehl edition. As first advertised (*Public Advertiser*, Feb 25, 1761) the work was to be published at the rate of one volume per month, the notice, however, omitted to say how many there would be. It is my opinion that, at the time, the editors themselves did not know, and were probably counting on finishing the work in three years (i.e. 36 vols). In vol 34 there is a notice "to the Public" which contains a curious *NB*—"The next volume, it is imagined, will complete the Works of Voltaire." The whole edition, then, was considered finished after the publication of the 35th volume—on March 1, 1765, according to the *Public Advertiser*. It was one of the conditions of the publishers' contract that the translation was to be made from the "last Geneva edition, published under M. Voltaire's own inspection." This cannot have been other than the Cramer brothers edition of 1756 (See C Walsh, *A Bookseller of the Last Century*, London, 1885, p. 326 ff. This reference, as well as information regarding the exact publication dates of the translation, I owe to the kindness of Professor Lewis M. Knapp).

² These, numbered I-VII, are also volumes 12-15, 18, 25, 27 of the complete works. Smollett's name is omitted from the title pages of these volumes, which strengthens the hypothesis that Smollett and Francklin worked apart from each other.

Letters, was "a small part of the translation" and "all the notes historical and critical."³ The latter statement must not be taken at its face value. It so happens that the editors of the translation intended it to be "bound up in two different sets," 1) "prose works" and 2) "dramatic and poetical works"⁴ Furthermore, the individual volumes of the two sets (each set numbered separately) were published at odd times from 1761 to 1765, receiving upon publication the next available number of the complete series in addition to their own.⁵ This would seem to indicate that the sets were edited independently, by men who did not consult each other. Further comparisons have borne this out: the notes in the prose works are quite different from the rest. They are far more abundant, in them the annotator, with one exception,⁶ uses the editorial "we,"⁷ and in speaking of Voltaire calls him Mr. *de* Voltaire, or more often "our author." His attitude toward the latter is severe: he points out many mistakes and inconsistencies in the original text, yet does not presume to pronounce judgment on the literary value of the individual works.⁸ On the other hand, the annotator of the drama and poetry leaves out the *particule* in Voltaire's name, his spelling is less modern than that of his fellow-editor ("shou'd," "advanc'd," "oblig'd," "refer'd," etc.), he occasionally uses old forms such as "murthering," and his style is often quite involved. Less tactful than his colleague, he criticizes

* E S Noyes, ed, *The Letters of Tobias Smollett, M D*, Letter 60, p 82. Ralph Griffiths, in his annotated copy of the *Monthly Review*, attributed to Smollett the translation of *Micromégas* (B C Nangle, *The Monthly Review*, first series, 1749-1789). To prove that he actually translated this tale would be difficult. The translation could be compared satisfactorily only with that of *Gil Blas*, and one would have to take into consideration the fact that Smollett's manner of translating had probably undergone a change from 1749 to 1761 (for Smollett's translation of *Gil Blas* see my *Smollett et la France*, Paris, 1935, pt 1, ch 3).

⁴ Cf advertisement at end of vol x.

⁵ The "prose works," clearly numbered I-XXVI, were given the following numbers of the complete set: 1-11, 16, 17, 19-23, 26, 28-31, 34-36. Vols 24, 32, and 33 contained poetry. For the dramatic works see note 2 above. Vols. 1-13 are dated 1761, vols. 14-24, 1762, vols. 25-31, 1763, vols. 33, 34, 1764; vols. 35, 36, 1765 and 1769.

⁶ VII, 197.

⁷ XXIII, 18, 50, 104, 145, etc.

⁸ Except in vol. XVI, 145, where he condemns as pure bathos a part of Voltaire's Eulogium on the officers who died in the war of 1741.

Voltaire for his poor translations of excerpts from English drama,⁹ and, calling "absurd" all comedies written in verse, does not hesitate at times to say that Voltaire's are "very awkwardly and inartificially done," "indifferent," and even "poor"¹⁰ It seems obvious, then, that each editor did his share of the work unaided by the other¹¹ But which set was edited by Smollett, and which by Francklin?

A clue is to be found in the drama and poetry The annotator of these occasionally discusses the various difficulties encountered in translating certain passages from the French, and in so doing uses the pronoun "I."¹² Thus he identifies himself with the translator, whom we *know* to have been Francklin and who was presumably in complete charge of this set.

Smollett thus remains as the annotator of the prose works only. Proof of this assertion is contained in the very notes themselves. they have a Smollettian ring and contain many reminiscences of his vocabulary and style.¹³ Certain statements on the gloom and the smells in the churches of Europe, on Sir Robert Walpole and the Whig administration, on Louis XIVth, on Admiral Vernon, and on "king" Theodore of Corsica¹⁴ remind us very forcibly of passages in *Peregrine Pickle*, the *Travels*, and the *History of England* There are numerous medical "asides," e.g. when Voltaire mentions that Pangloss has lost an ear through contracting a social disease, Smollett's note suggests that this misfortune would be more likely to have happened to his nose and palate.¹⁵ Finally, a conclusive proof, if one were still needed, can be found in the remark "In the affair off St. Domingo, the number and strength of the ships on both sides were equal, *if we may believe our own eyes*, which were witnesses of the transaction."¹⁶

Smollett is commonly supposed to have been guilty of lending

⁹ xxv, 147-149, 154

¹⁰ xv, 221, xxvii, 118

¹¹ Smollett was not easy to get along with, Francklin was unpopular with most of the literary men of the time (*DNB*) Neither of them seems to have been fitted for close collaboration of any kind

¹² xiii, 13, xiv, 122, 241, xv, 97, 105, 191, 242, 256

¹³ iv, 179, viii, 162, etc

¹⁴ xi, 230, xix, 72-75, vii, 96, 162, 170, 171, xix, 96, xix, 32; xxiii, 123

¹⁵ xxiii, 15

¹⁶ xix, 97 The italics are mine

his name to publications with which he had nothing to do, and, despite his assertion to the contrary,¹⁷ his biographers and critics have been a little too eager to give credence to the accusation. As we have seen, there can be no question that he did participate in the edition of Voltaire, and if he claimed *all* the notes historical and critical he can be excused on the ground that the drama and poetry, for which he was not responsible, called for very little historical and critical annotation. His notes are interesting in that we see in them a historian correcting the statements of another and greater historian, and refuting some of his arguments. No error seems to him too small to be passed over, Highland dress, Pepin le Bref's sons, the geography of Russia, the Romance languages, the explosive properties of gunpowder, the meaning of Latin inscriptions, the remote ancestry of Genghis Khan—all are capable of evoking very learned comments from him. However, it is possible to see in his very zealotry in correcting another historian a kind of "defense mechanism" resulting from wounded pride and chagrin at being almost entirely superseded by Hume as England's most popular historian.¹⁸ Whether reason was on Smollett's side or not, he justifies his comments by numerous references to ancient and modern historians and, in keeping with his rather pontifical pronouncements in the *Critical Review*, he does not hesitate to use the adjectives "frivolous," "unsatisfactory," "chimerical" of many of Voltaire's ways of reasoning, nor to say that the latter's representation of certain facts is "invidious and unjust," or even "a meek fable, rejected by the best historians." Yet his criticism is not always adverse, he occasionally praises Voltaire for the "spirit of independence, candour, and moderation" which he has "so sensibly and elegantly displayed."¹⁹

Smollett's annotation varies according to the nature of the work he is editing. For instance, he subjects Voltaire's treatment of Ancient History to a great deal of correction and refutation,²⁰

¹⁷ Noyes, *op cit*, p. 82.

¹⁸ His *Continuation*, however, was the only good history of contemporary England (c. 1748-1760).

¹⁹ IX, 81. Cf. XXII, 3-4.

²⁰ It is well known that religion and the religious side of life are practically ignored by Smollett in his writings. Yet when Voltaire attacks the Church, or praises Mohammedanism to the detriment of Christianity, our author seeks as much as possible to make the necessary corrections by

whereas he has little or nothing to add to a comparatively well-documented work such as the *History of Charles XIIth*. Again we find that his notes become more numerous when England and things English are discussed in the text: they increase in direct proportion to his mounting indignation at Voltaire's "French" point of view, especially in the discussion of recent Franco-British wars: "we must give our author leave," he says, "to write like a Frenchman" ²¹. His predilection, however, lies in the annotation of the tales, which appeal especially to the satirical novelist in him. He applauds whenever Voltaire has a particularly happy illustration of the "folies and foibles" of mankind ²². On the last page of *Candide* he points out the moral of this tale, ²³ and places at the beginning of *Zadig*, *Micromégas*, and the *Travels of Scarmentado* a note explaining the author's design in writing each one of these. ²⁴ It is curious to note to what extent Smollett, as a realistic novelist insisting on strict probability in fiction, looks for inconsistencies in the tales. In general his observations are just, but too often lack imagination and show him to be rather destitute of humor. ²⁵

The only contemporary comments on Smollett's edition of Voltaire that I have been able to find are those of the two important Reviews of the day, the *Monthly* and the *Critical*. In view of Smollett's connection with the latter, it is not difficult to imagine how his work will fare at the hands of these rival organizations. The *Critical*, expressing its satisfaction that "gentlemen of approved abilities" have united in editing and translating the works of the "celebrated Mr. de Voltaire, the most original, pleasing, and popular writer of his age and country," praises highly the notes for the edition ²⁶. The article in the *Monthly Review*, however, is of

giving, in the notes, a more objective view of the subject under discussion (I, 171, 282, II, 131)

²¹ VIII, 74

²² XI, 143, 244, XXIII, 3, 9, 11, 41, 44, 134

²³ XXIII, 141. Smollett does not spot the literary fraud of the spurious second part of *Candide*, but in his notes he does not value it very highly, criticizing sharply its numerous extravagances (e.g. XXIII, 160, 178, 200)

²⁴ These notes all begin in the same way: "The [intelligent] reader will at once perceive that this piece . . ." (XI, 129, XI, 253, XVI, 92)

²⁵ E.g. he takes exception to Voltaire's having *Micromégas*, a giant, travel about on a sunbeam (XI, 256. Cf. also XXIII, 80, 195)

²⁶ XI (1761), pp. 377-381. This is the sole criticism on the Smollett edition of Voltaire to be found in the *Critical*, yet the translation took

greater interest, for in it Smollett gets what is probably the most abusive treatment he ever received from the pen of a contemporary critic. It would be easy to impute this to the rivalry existing between the Reviews, yet all of Smollett's works, from the *Regicide* in 1749 to the *Ode to Independence* in 1773, received courteous if sometimes severe treatment in the *Monthly*.²⁷ This being true, it is curious to come upon a bitter criticism of Smollett.

This article was written by William Kenrick, and its scurrility is thus partly self-explained, for he was undoubtedly as rancorous a knave as it was possible to meet in the Grub Street of the time.²⁸ In 1758 a poem of his, *Epistols Philosophical and Moral*, was frowned upon by the *Critical Review* for its sceptical tone.²⁹ Kenrick answered with a pamphlet entitled *A Scrutiny, or the Criticks Criticized*.³⁰ This in turn was severely treated by the Review, and since that time Kenrick seemed to have borne Smollett a great deal of ill-will. But he refrained for a time from attacking him openly, probably realizing that the latter was no mean opponent and that several well-known writers had felt the lash of his satire.³¹ It seems very much in keeping with Kenrick's character that he waited to write his biting review until after Smollett, broken in health and spirits, had left England and could not retaliate.³² Being himself a translator, Kenrick does bring to light

five years to publish. This is strange, in a review which regularly, month after month, published long accounts of the *Modern Part of a Universal History*, also edited by its collaborator, Smollett.

²⁷ VIII, 203, XIII, 196, XLIX, 500 (by Ralph Griffiths) XVIII, 289, XXVIII, 249, 359 (by Owen Ruffhead) I, 59, IV, 355 (by John Cleland) XI, 441 (by John Hawkesworth). XVI, 530 (by Oliver Goldsmith) XXXIV, 419 (by John Berkenhout). We now know the authors of these articles—thanks to B. C. Nangle's invaluable Index, already mentioned above.

²⁸ See *DNB*.

²⁹ IV, 439-453.

³⁰ London, 1759. Kenrick himself reviewed his own *Scrutiny*, of course giving himself the better of the argument (*Monthly Review*, XX, 219).

³¹ Smollett and Kenrick have something in common: they attacked Fielding, Garrick and others in their works, for much the same reasons, but Smollett's attacks were momentary lapses from grace, whereas Kenrick's were part and parcel of his work as scurrilous pamphleteer and libeller.

³² Smollett had left England in June. Kenrick's review was published in the *Monthly* for October, 1763 (XXIX, 273-282); 27 volumes of the Voltaire translation had already appeared at this time. Smollett may have written the crushing account (*Critical Review*, XX, 332) of Kenrick's

a certain number of mistranslations, but he magnifies these insignificant mistakes beyond all proportion, and consequently damns the whole English edition of Voltaire as a worthless production. The translators, whom he calls "unknown and desperate braves," have, according to him, "mangled" Voltaire horribly, but what adds to the inhumanity of this treatment is the fact that their work has been carried on "under the sanction of respectable names." And here Kenrick attacks Smollett openly "For a writer of reputation," he insists, "to consent to be made the forehorse in the team of dulness, and let out his name and fame, to countenance the productions of anonymous blunderers, is making a strange and most illiberal sacrifice to Mammon"

Smollett and Francklin had stated in their foreword that in order to do justice to Voltaire's "merit," and to "supply his defects" they proposed to illustrate their translation with notes which might "correct his mistakes, elucidate his obscurities, point out his beauties, and explain his allusions to the satisfaction of the public." Kenrick's review shows that he was infuriated by this somewhat smug pronouncement, he therefore seized on it in order to humiliate Smollett, pointing with glee to several instances in which Voltaire is censured for something he did not write but which was a blunder of the translator. Here again Kenrick is picking at small things for want of something tangible to criticize. His review is unjust in that it cavils at insignificant details while ignoring good points. I am inclined to agree with him, however, when he criticizes the cavalier manner in which Smollett dismisses some of Voltaire's statements and ideas. Smollett deserved a little to be called by Kenrick a "caiping hypocrite, who with the strength of a boy would correct the labors of an Hercules."

Kenrick's review to the contrary, Smollett and Francklin's edition is a very acceptable piece of work. It had the merit of being the first to present to English readers a complete and authorized version (up to 1765) of Voltaire, and accordingly was more popular than any other English translation of the latter's works³³. It had two editions in the eighteenth century, and "the Smollett trans-

bating *Review of Dr Johnson's new edition of Shakespeare* (phrases such as "This Drawcansir of a reviewer" are reminiscent of Smollett's unfortunate attack of Fielding)

³³ According to Ronald S. Crane in "The Diffusion of Voltaire's Writings in England" (*MP*, Feb. 1923, p. 266)

lation" of certain works such as *Candide* and the *History of Charles XIIth* was often re-edited in the nineteenth. In 1859 in an American edition of the latter work, O W Wight, the editor, said "We have used the translation made by Dr. Smollett and others, printed in London, 1762, diligently comparing it with the original and revising it throughout," and again "We have used every endeavor to perfect the fine old translation of Charles XII" In 1901 there appeared an English translation in 42 volumes of Voltaire's Works, avowedly taken from Smollett's edition, in which the editor (O H. G Leigh) wrote "The original notes by Dr Smollett . . . are retained where helpful or in his characteristic vein" ³⁴

Thus Smollett's (and Franklin's) edition of Voltaire was much more than a mere compilation or a bookseller's venture, and is to be taken far more seriously than has heretofore been the case. The student of Smollett can find in it much that is revealing, whether it concerns the latter's character or his learning ³⁵

EUGÈNE JOLIAF

The University of Iowa

CASTILLO SOLÓRZANO'S *EL CELOSO HASTA LA MUERTE* AND MONTFLEURY'S *ECOLE DES JALOUX*

Looking for a source is like calling your untrained dog stop whistling and, before long, he will be at your heels.

After convincing myself that Fournel and Rohr were right in rejecting Lope's *Argel fingido*, proposed by Puibusque and von Schack, as the source of Montfleury's *Ecole des Jaloux*, I gave up the search and published my account of the play¹. Three years

³⁴ Actually very few of Smollett's notes were retained in this edition.

³⁵ Prof Lewis Knapp has very kindly communicated a note which he found in the *Chelmsford Chronicle* for Nov 8, 1771 "The late Dr Smollett, a short time before his death, at the particular request of Voltaire, sat to an eminent painter for his portrait, which was transmitted soon after to that celebrated genius, who sent the doctor a handsome diamond ring in return." Voltaire, no doubt, had not seen Smollett's notes! No proof exists for this fanciful anecdote.

¹ In my *History of French Dramatic Literature*, Part III, pp 289-91.

later Mr. Einst G. Mathews sent me an article in which he argued that *The False Count* (1682) of Mrs. Aphra Behn was derived from *El celoso hasta la muerte* (1631) ² As I pointed out to him, this is true only in the sense that Castillo Solórzano's tale inspired Mrs. Behn's source, yet it was his analysis of *El celoso* that enabled me to recognize in it the source that had previously eluded students of Montfleury.

The name and character of the protagonist, Santillane, the chief episode of the play, and even some details of the dialogue were taken from the Spanish story. In both works a Spanish nobleman, hoping to punish and reform a jealous and overbearing husband, has him take a boat trip, ostensibly for pleasure, fall into the hands of men who pretend to be "moors" or Turks, and appear before a valet disguised as a Mohammedan sovereign, who humiliates him, threatens to take his wife into his harem, and finally induces him to promise that he will be jealous no more. For Don Carlos de Borja, Duke of Gandía, Montfleury substituted Carlos, Governor of Cadiz, former lover of Léonor, Santillane's wife, and now engaged to her sister. He changed the scene to Cadiz, had Santillane believe he was taken before the Sultan at Constantinople instead of Mahomad Yafer or Xafer at Algiers, added details that make the story more plausible, reduced the time of the action, and stopped after Santillane had renounced his jealousy, instead of going on, as Castillo Solórzano had done, to tell of his death from suppressed jealousy and his wife's remarriage.

His main originality lies in the fact that the insanely jealous husband he depicts is forced to beg his wife to betray him, for Santillane agrees with those who prefer to be "cocus dix fois, que d'être pendus une." Out of a rambling story from which the idea may be derived that jealousy, though renounced, will cease only with death, Montfleury constructed a three-act comedy centered about a jealous husband forced to realize that his wife's virtue is far superior to his own. What the future will bring to the couple is left to the reader's imagination. The play was successful enough to be acted as late as 1730 and to be translated into German. The influence it had on Mrs. Behn will be shown in the following article.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

² It is the ninth *novela* of the *Noches de plazer*.

MONTFLEURY'S *ECOLE DES JALOUX* AND APHRA
BEHN'S *THE FALSE COUNT*

Professor Lancaster has explained how he rescued me from erroneously tracing Mrs. Behn's *The False Count* (1682) directly to Castillo Solórzano's *El celoso hasta la muerte*. The latter certainly came to Mrs. Behn only through Montfleury's *Ecole des Jaloux* (ca. 1662).

The Carlos-Julia plot in *The False Count* (the other plot, possibly derived from *Les Précieuses Ridicules*, gives the title but is really the subplot) makes use of nearly every detail of the *comédie*, sometimes paraphrasing whole episodes. Carlos, the former lover of Julia (Montfleury's Léonor), is crudely snubbed by the jealous husband, Francisco (Santillane). Guzman (the name is hispaniolized from the French) devises the Turkish mummery to teach the husband a lesson. Francisco is reduced to a mass of cowardly fear, his momentary rebellions are squelched by threats of beating and castration, and he is forced, finally, to beg his wife to cuckold him. "Turkish" speech, as in the French, is actually used in these scenes, whereas in the Spanish tale it is merely said to have been employed.

Mrs. Behn's changes are numerous and most of them are designed to adapt the play to English taste. She adds a few characters—Baltazer, the father of Julia, Clara, the sister (who is merely mentioned in Montfleury), and Petro,—and gives the characters of the other plot some part in the masquerade. For Santillane, the *jaloux*, she substituted Francisco, a jealous base-born English cordwainer naturalized in Seville, a wealthy "cit," whose age and impotence made it, according to the Restoration code, incumbent upon Carlos to cuckold him. Whereas the French Léonor is completely loyal to Santillane, Julia still loves Carlos, and appears, in II, 1, to be quite of Carlos's mind. Hence her professions of loyalty in the Turkish scenes (where Carlos, not Guzman, plays the Grand Turk) sound inconsistent and hollow. She never, like her prototype, objects that the joke is carried too far. In the end Francisco, after having abjured his jealousy and having recognized Julia's virtue, as Santillane did in *L'Ecole*, hands his wife over to Carlos. His consolation is that he and Carlos "are upon equal terms, for he makes himself my Cuckold, as he has already made me his;—for, if my memory fail me not, we did once upon a time consummate."

Mrs Behn's "excellent rattling farce" was not, then, an ingenious elaboration of the famous galley scene in *Les Fourberies de Scapin* or Cyrano's *Le Pédant Joué*.¹ She took over Montfleury's *comédie*, which is tidy, regular (except for a shift of scene), faithful in most details to its Spanish source, and fairly high in moral tone. Her changes were such as many Restoration dramatists thought sufficient to justify a claim of originality. Her play is in the English fashion, irregular,² double-plotted, and complicated in intrigue. The new characterization of Francisco, Carlos, and Julia, together with added license in language, eliminated all savor of morality and increased the element of farce.

ERNST G. MATHEWS

University of Illinois

FINAL CONSONANT PLUS N-GLIDE IN JALISCO, MEXICO

A linguistic peculiarity, commonly heard in the state of Jalisco, Mexico, is a final voiced *n*-glide which occurs, not only after final *s*, (already reported)¹ but also after final *r* and occasionally *d*. If, according to Ramón Menéndez Pidal,² only six final consonants are used in modern Spanish (*d, n, l, r, s, z*), there are but five in Spanish America, and one of these is *n*, which is the final consonant under discussion. The remaining four all tend, at times, to disappear from modern colloquial Spanish-American speech.³

The writers, having gone to Mexico recently with a particular ear for this phenomenon, submit the thesis that the tendency to slur or

¹ Montague Summers (*The Works of Aphra Behn*, London, 1915, III, 97) thought it to be

² Besides adding another plot Mrs Behn represents the capture by the Turks in direct action (IV, I); Montfleury (II, III) merely has Gusman report it

³ Marden, C. C. "The Phonology of the Spanish Dialect of Mexico City," *PMLA*, XI (1896), 133. Henríquez Ureña, Pedro "Observaciones Sobre el Español en América," *RFE*, VIII (1921), 378. Wright, Leavitt O. "Final *S* Plus *N*-Glide in Mexico," *MLN*, XLIX (1934), 18-19.

⁴ *Manual de Gramática Histórica Española*, 5ª edición, Madrid, 1929, 140.

⁵ Henríquez Ureña, *op. cit.*, 365, 372, 373, 376, Marden, *op. cit.*, 118, 119, 130.

drop a final *s*, *d* or *r* is being checked by the subconscious ⁴ addition of an *n*-glide of varying intensity.

The *n*-glide may follow a stressed final syllable or monosyllable ending in *s* or *z*, as in *¿A dónde vasn?* *¿De dónde esn?* *¿Qué me dasn?* *¡Otra vezn!* *¡Ay Diosn!* *¡Adiós!*⁵ Not only is it used in interrogations and exclamations, but one commonly hears natives of Jalisco count slowly up to ten, adding the extra semi-syllable after the *s*-sound, saying *dosn*, *tresn*, *seisn* and *diezn*. It also occurs in declaratory statements *Déjeme en pazn*, *Pos sí, puesn*, and infrequently is it heard after a final unstressed *s*-sound, as in *vamosn*.

We noticed two somewhat different shades of the sound of this final semi-syllable. One shade is accompanied by a drop in the voice pitch, which in musical terminology might be described as approximately a major third. The other shade is accompanied by a distinct rise in the voice pitch which would be represented in music by as great an interval as a major fifth or even a sixth ^{5a}

Marden ⁶ says of the sound "This *n*-glide is caused by lowering the velum before the *s*-sound is completed; the tongue position remains the same and the stream of breath continues its passage through the nose, thus producing the nasal-glide." But, as we heard it most frequently, the tongue-position shifts a bit, rising at the front against the hard palate to make a clear-cut voiced *n*-sound.

⁴ No representation of this speech peculiarity was found in three Mexican dialect novels set in this locality *Los de Abajo* and *Mala Yerba* by Mariano Azuela, *Los Cristeros* by J. Guadalupe de Anda, nor in the collection of poems by Marcelino Dávalos, *Del Bajío y Airibeñas*. The authors are original residents, and for them the phenomenon seems to hold no interest, since they do not call attention to it.

⁵ These examples are exact quotations from the lips of Mexican acquaintances in Jalisco. Testimony from a non-specialist in Mexican linguistics appears in Emma Lindsay Squier's *Gringa—An American Woman in Mexico*, Houghton Mifflin, 1934, 123. "you say 'Adios-n Adios-n' 'Adios' means 'hello' as well as 'good-bye,' and that final *n* they put on the word here is characteristic of Jalisco."

^{5a} There is a corresponding rise in the voice pitch in such an English expression as "Do you want any more?" We may, in interrogation and exclamation, carry the same tone through the first four words, and then raise the pitch on "more" to express the desire for a reply, or carry through the same tone, and then, while saying "more," sluu the pitch upward, saying "mo-wer." Or we may, while expressing an affirmation, drop the voice pitch at the end, and say "I want some more or mo-wer."

⁶ *Op cit*, 133

Henríquez Ureña⁷ speaks of the "ene opaca en el Estado de Jalisco" and says ". . . la nasalización mexicana podía representarse burdamente como *pueesn* (la *ese* es muy larga, nasalizada, y la *ene* es alveolar o dental, pero a veces falta)" We have heard it commonly rendered as *pueeesn*, with a much prolonged vowel, and the *s* clear, though short, followed by a rapidly pronounced *n*. Thus, in the slow counting referred to above, we heard "*uuuno, dooosn, treeesn, cuaaatro, cuunco, seeeesn, seeete, ooocho, nueeeve, dreeezn*."

In this case, the extra semi-syllable seems almost purposeful, or at least semi-consciously produced, since (1) in the case of counting, it makes all the numerals two syllabled, (2) when used in a question, it seems to demand a reply, and (3) when appended to an exclamation, it adds to the dramatic effect of the expression. But in the case of the pitch drop, the sound may be less consciously produced, and it is at times less distinct, resembling a gentle grunt, with the tongue resting in position for an *n*, but barely pronouncing it. It is at times an unvoiced *n*. Perhaps this is what Henríquez Ureña describes as "ene opaca," occurring after a prolonged *s*, and Nykl tries to represent in the symbols "dosũ, tresũ, esũ," etc.⁸

This speech habit is not limited to Guadalajara, but is heard as far south as Ciudad Guzmán, and northward through the Los Altos region. It was curious to have several Guadalajara residents who were questioned admit having heard it but deny its being a characteristic of local speech, ascribing it rather to the region northeast of Guadalajara. And a resident of a northeast plateau county-seat, Tepatitlán, said that the *n*-glide was an innovation recently imported to mimic the speech of Guadalajara, yet in the same town one of the many who used the *n*-glide was an elderly life-long resident, heard counting to a child and using a very clear *s* plus *n*-glide.⁹

A speech phenomenon not hitherto described to our knowledge is

⁷ *Op cit*, 378

⁸ A. R. Nykl, "Notes on the Spanish of Yucatán, Vera Cruz, and Tlaxcala," *MP*, xxvii (1930), 458

⁹ Not only does *s* take on a consonantal sound after it, but at times it is preceded by a *t*-sound, as in "tsí, señor," when the tongue comes from a resting position to attack an initial *s*-sound. Cf. Henríquez Ureña, *op cit*, 376-7, who discusses a similar sound when medial

the final *r* plus *n*-glide. This was heard in the same region as the *s* plus *n*-glide, and corresponds in production more to the first shade than the second, in that the voice pitch frequently drops unconsciously in the additional semi-syllable, as in *Voy a cambiar a mi señorn*. However, it is also used with the up-pitch in interrogations and exclamations to add the touch of inquiry or surprise, as in. *¿De este colorn?* and *¿Ahoy va a sein?* Furthermore, while we usually expect the final syllable of a question to be pronounced with an interrogatory up-pitch, this little speech-quirk leaves the full wording in the same voice pitch, and then adds an extra semi-syllable in a higher pitch to express the desire for a reply.

Final *d* plus *n*-glide was heard with the same up-pitch and down-pitch, as in *la paternidadn*, *la tempestadn*, *¿Es verdadn?* Surely we have here another case of a subconscious semi-syllable supporting a consonant which, when final, tends to weaken or disappear.

LEAVITT O. WRIGHT

STANLEY L. ROBE

The University of Oregon

"THE HOURS OF THE PLANETS" AN OBSCURE PASSAGE IN "THE RECLUSE"

In the Lollard interpolated version of the *Anciene Riwle* known as *The Recluse*,¹ at the end of an early interpolation dealing with the meditations appropriate to the canonical hours, there occurs a passage whose meaning has, until recently, eluded me. I reproduce it here from Pålsson's text, where, very commendably, the punctuation of the MS² is followed:

Nou þise houres þat ich haue spoken of vche man þat haþ taken this
tendom owe to haue hem in mynde as forþ as he may oþer in þouȝth
oþer in dede þat is be in biddyng and wite ȝe wel who so haþ hem
in mynde wiþ goode wille . god nyl nouȝth leten þat he ne wil helpen hym
att his nede and teche hym as is best for hym boþe to lyf and to soule
*Nou to þe houres of þe day men may comen bot nouȝth to þe houres of þe
Planeetes . for þat tyme he was pyned þe houres of þe Planeetes acorden
wiþ þe houres of þe day . þe Planeetes ben þat þe dayes in þe weeke ben*

¹ *The Recluse*, edited J. Pålsson, Lund 1911 reprinted with notes, 1918
On the interpolations, see my article in *The Review of English Studies*

² MS Pepys 2498, Magdalene College, Cambridge

cleped after þat is þe sonne and þe mone and þe fyue sterres þat stonden lowȝer þan any oþere sterres ³

The difficulty lies in the interpretation of the phrases which I have italicised. If we amend "acorden" to "acorde(de)n" a possible version would be

Now men may calculate the hours of the day, but not the hours of the planets, for, at the time of Christ's Passion, the hours of the planets coincided with the hours of the day

I adhered to this interpretation, although I did not profess to understand it, until my friend and teacher Professor Grattan pointed out to me that, if "for" were taken to mean "with respect to," the following version, superior since it does not necessitate any emendation of the MS reading, became possible.

Now men may calculate the hours of the day, but not, with respect to the time of Christ's Passion, the hours of the planets The hours of the planets and the hours of the day agree

That this version is the correct one appears from the sections of *The Astrolabe* in which Chaucer distinguishes between "houres equales, that is to seyn, the houres of the klokke" and "houres inequales," by which term, as Skeat explains, Chaucer meant a twelfth of the artificial day or night, which were calculated as of twelve hours each ⁴ Chaucer gives a very clear account of "houres inequales" where he writes of

the houres of planetes by ordre as they sitten in the hevens. The first houre unequal of every Saterdag is to Saturne, and the secounde, to Iupiter, the 3, to Mars, the 4, to the Sonne, the 5, to Venus, the 6, to Mercurius, the 7, to the Mone, and thanne agayn, the 8 is to Saturn, the 9, to Iupiter, the 10, to Mars, the 11, to the Sonne, the 12, to Venus, and now is my sonne gon to reste as for that Setterday ⁵

The order in which he names the planets is the order in which they become, at sunrise, "lords of the ascendant," the reverse order of their nearness to the earth.⁶ Thus, for Good Friday, the order of the planets, and the hours which they would govern, the "houres inequales" or "hours of the planets," would be

³ Pp. 18-19

⁴ *The Astrolabe*, edited Skeat, Oxford, 1894, p. 196 and note

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 197

⁶ See, in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, the very valuable introduction to the article "Sun, Moon and Stars"

Venus	Mercury	Moon	Saturn	Jupiter	Mars	Sun
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24				

In the "Seventh Letter to Polycarp" attributed by medieval tradition to St Dionysius the Areopagite, the miraculous nature of the eclipse on Good Friday is said to have consisted in the sun's eclipse in *Puschate*, when the moon is full and in opposition to the sun, in the eclipse's lasting three hours, whereas the moon's passage is normally accelerated in such eclipses, in the moon's passage's being in reverse order, from east to west, in the moon's resumption, after the eclipse, of its normal passage, in the moon's entirely obscuring the sun, though less than the sun, in the fact that stars were seen in the heavens, and that an earthquake occurred, and in the manifestation of the eclipse throughout the earth.⁷

Although no specific reference is made here to any disturbance of the entire planetary system (nor have I found any other patristic authority which gives such a reference), it may well be that the allusion to the appearance of stars during the eclipse either refers to some such tradition already current, or contains the first elements of such a tradition, later to be elaborated.

The last circumstance referred to in the "Letter to Polycarp," the manifestation of the eclipse throughout the earth, appears frequently in the devotional writings of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries in England, where an increasing devotion to the Passion is to be observed, together with a growing tendency to describe the events of the Passion with much imaginative detail. Thus in the *Meditation on the Passion* (which is derived from Rolle's *Meditations*), prefixed to *Three Arrows on Doomsday*, we read

¶ Thynk on þase wonderes þat fele þat tyme how creatures þat na witte
had forthogth of his dede, and mad sorow on þaire manere, and kid at þai
felid his dede ful sare þe sone withdrogh hym and wex myrke

and in a similar passage in Julian of Norwich's *Revelations of Divine Love*, where she, too, treats of the eclipse on Good Friday,

⁷ Cornelius à Lapide. *Commentarii* viii 541

⁸ Horstmann *Yorkshire Writers* (London 1895) i 115.

I have observed the only other reference to a disturbance of the planetary system which is known to me

God of hys goodnes that makyth planettes and the elementes to worke in ther kynde to the blessyd man and to þe cursyde ¶ Jn that tyme it was withdraw fro both wher for it was þat they that knew hym nott were in sorow that tyme °

There can be little doubt that both Julian of Norwich and the interpolator of *The Recluse* are refering to the same tradition In the light of the passage just cited from Julian of Norwich¹⁰ there can be little doubt that we should interpret the passage from *The Recluse* thus

Now men may calculate the hours of the day, but not, with respect to the time of Christ's Passion, the hours of the planets (Normally) the hours of the planets and the hours of the day agree (but at the time of Christ's Passion, the whole planetary system was disturbed, and the hours of the planets were not operative)

ERIC COLLEDGE

Liverpool

THE DOUBLETS OLD ICELANDIC SKYTI SKYTJA, 'SHOOTER, MARKSMAN'

Axel Kock (*Skand. Archiv*, I, p. 12) has explained the form *skytja* as an original *jōn*-stem denoting the abstract verbal idea 'Schliessen,' which later passed over into a nomen agentis 'Schutze,' parallel to *hetja* = 'Hetzen' > 'Hetzer'

Kock's hypothesis, however, still leaves unexplained the reason why a *jōn*-stem *skytja*¹ should have come into existence at all when the normal form *skyti* with identically the same meaning

⁹ MS Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, Fonds anglais 40, f 37v

¹⁰ The passage may be read in its context in a modernised version in *Revelations of Divine Love*, edited Dom Roger Hudson, London, 1927, p 51 The editor points out in a note to the passage that the "Saint Dionyse of France" to whom Julian refers is actually St Dionysius the Areopagite

¹ In connection with the compositum *ú-skytja* 'bad marksman' instead of normal *ú-skyti* Kock (p 9) suggests that the *jōn*-stem connotes a disparaging sense as when feminine attributes are applied to males (cf the proper names *Sturla*, etc p 2 ff).

already existed. There must have been some *reason* for the doublet forms. It will be noted that for *hetja* there is no normal form **hetti*.

For *kempa* alongside *kappi* 'warrior' Kock offers two possible explanations viz (1) *kempa* a loan word from OE *cempa* with retention of the OE suffix *-a* which served as the starting point for the *ön*-inflection in ON (p 8), (2) *kempa* < **kampjōn* = 'Kampfen' > 'Kämpfer' parallel to *hetja* < **hatjōn* = 'Hetzen' > 'Hetzer' (p 12)

In the latter case Kock identifies OIcel *kempa* with OSwed *kæmpa* on the ground that the conditions under which *mp* was assimilated to *pp* in ON have not yet been satisfactorily determined. But such a discrepancy as **kampan* > OIcel. *kappi* and **kampjōn* > OIcel. *kempa* seems irreconcilable and therefore OIcel *kempa* is best explained as due to the OE form *cempa*.

If we assume then that OIcel *kempa* represents OE *cempa*, we have a very clear reason why a feminine *ön*-stem *kempa* existed alongside the normal *jan*-stem *kappi*.

On the other hand, the explanation of *skytja* as an original *jōn*-stem fails to account for its *existence* alongside the earlier normal form *skyti*. That *skytja* is of later origin than *skyti* seems probable from the fact that *skytja* appears only in the later sagas (cf. Cleasby-Vígfússon), it is not recorded by Larsson (*Orðforráðet*) nor does it occur in the *Elder Edda*,² whereas *skyti* appears twice in the *Elder Edda* (*Völ.* 6, 1, 12, 1).

In view of the doublets *skyti* *skytja* and the apparently later origin of *skytja* a better explanation for the form *skytja* than that offered by Kock is to assume that *skytja* represents an analogical formation after the model of *kempa*, i e., according to the proportion *kappi* *kempa* hence *skyti* **skytja*. The *j* of the suffix in *skyt-ja* would naturally be retained, whereas the original *j* of the suffix in *kemp-a* was already lost in OE *cempa* (< **kamp-jan*). This formal analogy could have been favored by common semantic factors, for a 'warrior' (*kappi*) would naturally likewise be a 'marksman' (*skyti*). At any rate the two activities could be closely associated.³

² The form *skytja* as recorded for skaldic poetry is uncertain (cf. Finnur Jónsson, *Lex Poet*)

³ Cf. *Hildebrandsli.* 51², *folc sceotantero*.

This secondary, analogical form *skytja* then, like *kempa*, accorded with the group of (*j*)*ōn*-stems denoting masculine agents, such as *hetja* 'Hetzer'. Under this category Kock (p. 12 ff.) does not mention a single example of a substantive (*j*)*an*-stem as a doublet form in OIcel,⁴ which fact seems to support my contention that the form *skytja* as a doublet for *skyti* represents a secondary, analogical *jōn*-stem rather than a PGic *jōn*-stem which survived only in ON. A form derived from a PGic. **skutjōn* does not appear elsewhere in the Old Gic dialects (cf. Fick under *skut*, *skuta*, etc., pp. 467-8).

The explanation which I here offer for OIcel *skytja* deserves preference over that offered by Kock in that my hypothesis accounts not only for the feminine *jōn*-stem as applied to males but also for the existence of the *jōn*-stem alongside the normal masculine *jan*-stem *skyti*, a factor which Kock has left out of consideration. Otherwise we may ask: Why was the existence of a (*j*)*ōn*-stem alongside the (*j*)*an*-stem confined to *skytja skyti*? No explanation of doublet forms is satisfactory unless a reason is given for the existence⁵ of the abnormal or less regular form. This Kock does only in the case of the pejorative compound *ú-skytja* 'bad marksman' (cf. footnote 1).

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

The University of Kansas

QUOTATIONS FROM ST. BERNARD IN "THE PARSON'S TALE"

Two quotations in "The Parson's Tale" from St. Bernard which have not hitherto been traced, according to F. N. Robinson,¹ are

Whil that I lyve I shal have remembrance of the travaillies that oure Lord Crist suffred in prechyng, his werynesse in travaylling, his temptaciouns whan he fasted, his longe wakynges whan he preyde, hise teeres whan that he weep for pitee of good peple, the wo and the shame and the filthe that

⁴ Feminine *ōn*-stems appear as doublet forms for *an*-stems in proper names, such as *Sturla Sturlu*, but these *ōn*-doublets may be explained with Kock (p. 2 ff.) as feminine attributes (i. e., nick-names).

⁵ The question here does not concern *heteroclisis* but a new formation independent of the normal declension.

¹ *Chaucer, Complete Works*, 1933, pp. 876, 878.

men seyden to hym, of the foule spitting that men spitte in his face, of the buffettes that men yaven hym, of the foule mowes, and of the repreves that men to hym seyden, of the nayles with which he was nayled to the croys, and of al the remenant of his passioun that he suffred for my synnes, and no thyng for his gilt (lines 256 259),

and "Usage of labour is a greet thyng, for it maketh, as seith Seint Bernard, the laborer to have stronge armes and haide synwes, and slouthe maketh hem feble and tendre" (line 690). The exact sources are St Bernard's "In Feria IV Hebdomadae Sanctae, Sermo," paragraph 11 (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CLXXXIII, 269)² and the "Epistola seu Tractatus ad Fratres de Monte Dei," chapter VIII, paragraph 23 (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CLXXXIV, 323)³ once attributed to St Bernard

A possible source for an unidentified reference to St Augustine in line 921, "and it was ordeyned that o man sholde have but o womman, and o womman but o man, as seith Seint Augustyn, by manye resouns," is St Augustine's "De Nuptiis et Concupiscentia," book I, chapter IX (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XLIV, 419).⁴

GEORGE SANDERLIN

The University of Maine

A CHAUCERIAN(?) FISHERMAN

Mr. McManaway's suggestion¹ of a possible and "conscious echo and adaptation of phrases from the first twelve lines of the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*," in *The Secrets of Angling* (1613) by J[ohn] D[ennys], is both interesting and significant. One wonders,

² "Proinde memor ero, quandiu fuero, laborum illorum quos pertulit in praedicando, fatigationum in discurrendo, tentationum in jejunando, vigiliarum in orando, lacrymarum in compatiendo Recordabor etiam dolorum ejus, conviciorum, sputorum, colaphorum, subsannationum, exprobrationum, clavorum, horumque similium, quae per eum et super eum abundantius transierunt"

³ "Eodem modo et de labore Rusticus duos habet nervos, fortes lacertos exercitatio hoc facit Sine eum torpere, mollescit."

⁴ "Verumtamen magis pertinere ad nuptiarum bonum, non unum et multas, sed unum et unam, satis indicat ipsa prima divinitus facta conjugum copula, ut inde connubia sumerent initium, ubi honestius attenderetur exemplum."

¹ *MLN.*, LIII, 422

however, whether such Chaucerian influence came to Dennys directly from the *Canterbury Tales* May it not, rather (and perhaps more probably), have come to Dennys through Sackville's Induction to his part in *A Mynor for Magistrates*, stanzas 1-3?

H F SCOTT-THOMAS

Acadia University

A NOTE FOR THE *NED*.

In a recent brief study of Dryden's diction, I found that a study, written in Latin, and published in Paris in 1881, by Alexandre Beljame, "*Quae e Gallicis Verbis in Anglicam Linguam Johannes Dryden Introduxerit*," evidently escaped the notice of the readers for the *NED*. For the following words Beljame indicates a use by Dryden ante-dating the first reference given in the *NED*: *brunette*, *burlesque*, *cajoling*, *carte blanche*, *critique*, *embarrass*, *fatigue*, *incontestable*, *parry*

To this list may be added two words of the same category, not mentioned by Beljame The *NED*. entry is given first

Cooing, vbl sb The action of the verb *coo*

2 *trans* See *coo* v 3, To converse caressingly or amourosly

1742 Young, *Nt Th* viii, 1272 Let not the Cooings of the World
allure thee

It occurs in 1673 in Dryden's *Marriage a la Mode*, III, 1 There is
such cooing and kissing among us, that indeed it is scandalous

Dauby, a 1 Of the nature of or resembling daub, sticky

1697, Dryden, *Vng Georg*, iv, 54 Th' industrious Kind with dawby
Wax and Flow'rs the Chinks have lin'd

It occurs in Dryden, *Annus Mirabilis*, sec 148 Some of the gall'd
ropes with dauby marling bind

E A. HAMMETT

*Mississippi Delta State
Teachers' College*

THE MEANING OF "GODS" IN *PARADISE LOST*

Although a few individual passages have been annotated, no editor has considered as a whole the problem of what Milton meant by "god" or "gods" in *Paradise Lost*¹ In most cases the meaning is clear from the context, yet there are a number of passages that call for comment "Gods" may mean (1) angelic beings, (2) classic gods, (3) gods other than the classic gods or Jehovah

I Angelic Beings

This is the most common meaning Throughout the poem the angels both of God and of Satan are referred to as "gods"²

[God speaks to the angels] But all ye Gods .
Adore the Son, and honour him as mee (III, 341)

In this category the following passages need comment

1 A Goddess arm'd
Out of thy [Satan's] head I sprung (II, 757)

The birth of Sin is so obviously modeled on the birth of Athene that "goddess" might here be thought to have a classic significance³ Since, however, spirits "can either sex assume," "goddess" may appropriately describe an angel, as when Satan says to Eve

Taste this and be henceforth among the Gods
Thyself a Goddess (v, 77)

2 Forbidd'n here, it [the apple] seems, as only fit
For Gods, yet able to make Gods of Men (v, 69)

ye shall be as Gods
Knowing both Good and Evil as they know (IX, 708)

These two passages from Satan's temptation of Eve involve the problem of the meaning of the plural form "Elohim" (gods) in the Hebrew text on which they are based⁴ Milton's choice among the many interpretations is made clear by the following:

¹ I exclude references to God the Father, which are always self-evident

² I, 116, 138, 240, 570, 629, II, 352, 391, 757, III, 341, IV, 526, V, 60, 70-81, 117, VI, 156, 452, VII, 329, IX, 100, 164, 489, 547, 708-718, 732, 804, 838, 866, X, 90, 502, XI, 271, 615

³ See also v, 77, IX, 546, 732

⁴ *Genesis*, 3, 5, 3, 22

[God speaks to the angels]
 O Sons, like one of us Man is become
 To know both Good and Evil, since his taste
 Of that defended Fruit (xi, 84)

"Us" cannot here be the "plural of excellence," as God the Father never speaks of himself in the plural.⁵ In the above passages, therefore, "gods" mean angels.⁶

3 Evil into the mind of God or Man
 May come and go, so unprov'd, and leave
 No spot or blame behind (v, 117)

Of this passage Saurat writes, "Terrible words, applied to God."⁷ Saurat misinterprets, "god" as usual means angel, as the context makes clear. Adam is reassuring Eve in regard to her evil dream; he explains that any man or even any angel might have such a thing happen to him without blame. Adam cannot possibly know what goes on within the mind of God the Father. This statement is not invalidated by the passages in Raphael's narrative to Adam where the angel reports dialogues between the Father and the Son, since Raphael has been directly commissioned to explain matters to Adam, and may therefore be supposed to have been inspired with the necessary knowledge. This circumstance is illustrated clearly in the vision of the future revealed to Adam by Michael.

4 scintial sap [of the tree of knowledge] deriv'd
 From Nectar, drink of Gods (iv, 837)

Nectar is the drink of the angels.⁸

5 [Satan] The whole Battalion views, thir order due,
 Thir visages and stature as of Gods (i, 569)

Satan finds that his followers, though doubtless as changed in appearance as he and Beelzebub were, are still recognizable as angelic beings. Milton can hardly be thinking of the classic gods, since the whole army of Satan is involved

⁵ See for example iii, 341, the first quotation in this article

⁶ There is an inconsistency, probably a mere inadvertence, in the following inducement strong

To us [Adam and Eve] as likely tasting to attain
 Proportional ascent, which cannot be
 But to be Gods, or Angels Demi-Gods (ix, 934)

⁷ Milton *Man and Thinker*, 133.

⁸ For example, v, 426-8; v, 632-3.

On two occasions Milton refers to the angels not as gods, but as demi-gods⁹

II Classic Gods

In several passages "gods" must refer to the classic gods¹⁰

[The race] That fought at *Thebes* and *Ilium*, on each side
Mixt with auxiliar Gods (I, 578)

In this category the following passages need comment

1 thou [Satan] wilt bring me [Sin] soon
To that new world of light and bliss, among
The Gods who live at ease (II, 866)

The reference is here not to the angels, who could not be said to "live at ease" in the newly created world, although they did freely visit it. The phrasing strongly suggests the Olympian gods described by both Homer¹¹ and Lucretius¹² as living at ease.

2 With Goddess-like demeanour forth she [Eve] went
(VIII, 59)

Milton probably has here a classic goddess in mind, since he later specifically compares Eve to Diana

[Eve] *Deha's* self
In gait surpass'd and Goddess-like deport (IX, 388)

III. Gods other than the Classic Gods or Jehovah

There remain a number of passages referring to pagan divinities other than those of Greece, or to a Supreme Being¹³

[Devils] durst fix
Thir Seats long after next the Seat of God,
Thir Altars by his Altar, Gods ador'd
Among the Nations round, and durst a bide
Jehovah thund'ring out of *Sion*¹⁴ (I, 382)

⁹ I, 796; IX, 934

¹⁰ I, 508, 579, II, 868, III, 470, IV, 714, VII, 40, VIII, 59, IX, 389, XI, 696

¹¹ *Iliad*, VI, 138, *Odyssey*, IV, 805

¹² *De Rerum Natura*, III, 18-24

¹³ I, 384, 435, 475, 481, 489, II, 108, 478, IV, 33, VI, 99, 301, 366, XII, 120, 122, 129.

¹⁴ In this illustration the pagan gods are represented as forms assumed by the leaders of Satan's fallen angels

In this category the following passages need comment:

- 1 [Moloch's] look denounc'd
Desperate revenge, and Battle dangerous
To less than Gods (II, 106)

The devils' revenge would not be particularly impressive if it were dangerous only to those beings who were less than angels, that is, men or animals. Only a being of the rank of God the Father would be in no danger from them.

- 2 [Devils] as a God
Extol him [Satan] equal to the highest in Heav'n (II, 478)
exalted as a God
Th' Apostate in his Sun-bright Chariot sat
Idol of Majesty Divine (VI, 99)

In each case Satan is being ranked above the angels, equal to God the Father.

- 3 O thou [Sun] that with surpassing Glory crown'd,
Look'st from thy sole Dominion like the God
Of this new World (IV, 32)

Elsewhere Uriel is said to be the regent of the sun,¹⁵ which is described in materialistic terms.¹⁶ Here the personification does not suggest an angelic being, nor could it very well apply to the classic sun-god, who was not the god of the world but a deity inferior to Zeus. Milton seems rather to be thinking of "God" in the sense of the Supreme Being. The Sun is as unrivaled in the world as the God of it would be.

- 4 [Before they joined battle, Michael and Satan]
likest Gods they seem'd,
Stood they or mov'd, in stature, motion, arms
Fit to decide the Empire of great Heav'n (VI, 301)

This is a difficult passage. The antagonists cannot here be compared to angels, since they are already angels. The passage is in a section of the poem which is closely modeled on Homer, one of heroic boasting by two heroes before the assembled armies, so that it is possible that Milton here had the classic gods in mind. On the whole, however, I think the passages should be read in the light of the next citation, Michael and Satan are so preeminent among the angels that each seemed like the Supreme Being of heaven.

¹⁵ III, 690.

¹⁶ III, 591 ff.

5

Adramalech and Asmadai,

Two potent Thrones, that to be less than Gods
Disdain'd.

(vi, 365)

Again, they were already angels. In this passage there is not the classic connotation of the one above. Clearly each Throne is ambitious to attain a rank equal to that of God the Father.

THEODORE H. BANKS

Wesleyan University

THREE UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF ABRAHAM COWLEY

When Abraham Cowley fled to France with the defeated Cavaliers, he left a record of his secretarial duties under Jermyrn in a series of letters, most of them addressed to his old school friend, Henry Bennet. Published in 1702,¹ these letters "give a short account of K. Charles II's affairs before he went to be crown'd in *Scotland* in the year 1650, and what Opinion the Cavaliers beyond Sea had of that unlucky Expedition."²

It is a pleasure to be able to add to this series two interesting letters with dates earlier than any of the group except the one discovered by Grosart.³ The letters⁴ are addressed to Sir Robert Long, *confidante* of Henrietta Maria and a member of King Charles's Privy Council. He must have been well acquainted with Cowley, in 1651 Cowley and Sir John Berkeley attempted to sell some of the Crown lands in Jersey, and Long as the guardian of

¹ Tom Brown, *Miscellanea Aulica. or, a Collection of State-treatises, never before publish'd* (London, 1702)

² *The Complete Works of Abraham Cowley*, ed. Alexander Grosart (Edinburgh, 1881), II, 340.

³ *Ibid.*, I, vi

⁴ The letter of 8 April and the letter to Evelyn are published with the kind permission of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Mr Julian P. Boyd, the librarian of the Society, informs me that nothing is known of the history of these letters save that they came to the Society with the main section of the Simon Gratz collection in 1922. The letter to Long of 12 February is transcribed from a facsimile in Maggs Brothers Catalogue No. 317 (November-December, 1913). Interestingly enough, letters from Sir Richard Browne to Long, written from Paris on the same expedition in 1649 and 1650, are listed and partially quoted in Catalogues 421 and 441.

the King's purse would have been in close touch with the agents. After the Restoration, Long was one of the trustees for Henrietta Maria when the manor of Oldcourt was assigned to Cowley.

Paris Apr 8 1650.

Sir,

It is impossible to guesse, without equall danger on both parts of being deceived, what will bee the issue of the present troubles in France, soe much depends upon the success of the seige of Bellegarde, where if the Court have the good fortune to goe through wth their busines, they will have opened a faire way to the settlement of the whole Kingdome, but on <the contrary> ^s the miscarriage before y^t place will in all probability bee very fatall to them, for there is soe great an indisposition every where y^t if the Physick woik not very well it will make the disease much more dangerous The third of this month they opened the trenches before the Town, and the Cardinall himselfe was soe busy at the work y^t an officer who stood close by his side was dangerously shot, Those of the Town hung out a flag wth this Motto, La Liberte des Princes où la Mort, and seem yet to bee in the resolution of defending themselves to the utmost, but unlesse the Mareschall <de Turrine> bee made able by great assistance from the Spaniard or out of Germany (from whence hee expects some troopes) to releive them, they must infallibly perish, for though many in France would bee ready to follow their good fortune, there are none will venture to stirre in <their> behalves wth out y^t encouragement, I think I told you in my last y^t the Dutchesse of Bullion had made an escape, but shee has had the ill fortune to bee taken again, and is now Prisoner in the Bastille Shee had for about a fortnights time hid her selfe in the Polish Ambassadours Howse, where I know not upon what suspition shee was searcht for, and found at last naked in an hute, which was not big enough to hold her cloths and all, the disorders in Provence are renewed, but upon the old score of their discontents against the Conte d'Halets their Governour, not for the Prince's sake, whose imprisonment was received there ^s wth great even publique demonstrations of joy, I think, because their ⁷ governour is of near kindred to the Prince of Conde The Conte d'Halets would have come into Marseilles but was refused entrance, and the Capitaine <of his guards> shot dead by his side from the Town, w^{ch} has put both parties into open hostility again. I am conscious y^t it is not very decent to interrupt you wth these things of soe much consideration to us, when you ^s <are> busy about y^t w^{ch} concernes us more then any thing else now in the world, w^{ch} is the Scotch Treaty, if y^t happen not to succeed wee shall have leysure enough for curiosity in the affaires of other Coun-

^s Pointed brackets indicate words inserted above the line in the manuscript.

^s Written over "their".

⁷ Written over some other word, probably "there".

^s Written over some other word.

tries, for wee are not likely to have any thing more to doe in our own, This is soe dear to all people, y^t I dare say besides some few at y^r Court, and the Independants in England, there are not twenty persons in the world y^t wish not an agreement on any conditions whatsoever, if good ones cannot bee obtained. In my opinion none can bee bad, y^t shall shall [sic] put a sword into the King's hands, soe y^t whilst other mens prayer is y^t the Scots may be moderate, mine is onely, y^t wee may bee wise, and then after a warre of two or three years wee shall find little inconvenience of an hard bargain now. I beg y^r pardon for the freedome of this discour^s w^{ch} is so unnecessary to you, or if <it> were otherwise, might yet perhaps savour too much of boldness in,

Y^r most obedient

Servant

A Cowley

I send you in a pacquet by it selfe
a Letter to the King from y^e Duke
& Senate of Venice, it came from
M^r Killgrew

Sir,

As I was burning by my Lords command all y^r Letters to him, having by chance bound up y^r Cypher wth them, I forgot y^t I had put it up wth y^r last Letter w^{ch} I had newly decypherd, and soe burnt y^t too, wherefore I desire you would bee pleased to use hereafter the Cypher betwixt my Lord of Ormond and your selfe, unlesse you think fit to command a copy of our old one to bee sent to mee, in the mean time I remember enough of it to decypher the Letters w^{ch} you <may> happen to write before this come to you, soe y^t <it can>^o beget noe inconvenience, for I want onely some of the names

[Note on page 4 in another hand]

M^r Cooley of 8th of Aprill 1650

Receyued the 14th

[Address] For the right Hon^{ble}

M^r Long

The second letter reads:

Paris Febr 12 1650

Sir

There is not any thing of news come from England since my last and then there was soe little, that the Diurnall from London does not speak one word of ether of y^e three Kingdomes. My lady Mother tells mee y^t shee has seen a Letter this week out of Holland, from S^r Alexand^re Humes w^{ch} says y^t my Lord Montrose has embarqued 1500 foot, and 800 horse, and was himselfe actually past wth them into Scotland, but I hear yet noe other confirmation of it. Wee expect the french Court here next weeke, their busines in Normandy is finished, the Dutchess of Longueville is gone

^o Written over some other word

from Diepe into Holland or Flanders (as is conceived) and the Duke Richelieu hath made his peace, and will come up to the Court this week, w^{ch} does not intend to stay in this place, but remove, as their busines shall guide them, ether into Picardy, if the Spaniards appear in any ¹⁰ considerable body upon y^e frontiere (for w^{ch} purpose they are said to be gathering together) or into Champagne and Burgundy, where the beginnings on the part of the Princes freinds, are yet but very faint, and not like to cost the King more trouble then those in Normandy, a place or two has already submitted, and it is beleived here that the Duke of Boullion hath likewise made his agreement, w^{ch} probably will ether draw in, or destroy the Mareschal de Turenne, who is in the most considerable condition of any y^t have yet appeared for the Princes There is noe cause at present why I should presume to enlarge this trouble to you, I am

S^r

Y^r most obedient

Servant

A Cowley

In the third letter we find "the one kind of prose wherein Mr Cowley was excellent, and that is his Letters to his private Friends In these he always expressed the native Tenderness and innocent Gaiety of his Mind" ¹¹ The letter is addressed to John Evelyn, one of Cowley's few intimate friends, and helps to fill the gap in the Cowley-Evelyn correspondence between 29 March 1663 and 13 May 1667.¹²

The winter of 1663-1664 was a bad one for Cowley in his rural retreat. The marshy countryside made him ill; Evelyn records, 2 January 1633/4 "To Barn Elms, to see Abraham Cowley after his sickness, and returned that evening to London" ¹³ This Cowley letter is a most graceful and friendly acknowledgment of the dedication to him of Evelyn's second edition of *Kalendarium Hortense*.

Lond̄ March 7 1664

S^r,

As I have long had many obligations to you for very great Civilities, soe

¹⁰ Written over the beginning of some other word

¹¹ *The Works of Mr Abraham Cowley*: In Two Volumes, edited by Archbishop Sprat (Tenth edition, London, 1707), p xxx

¹² The first one may be found in Arthur H Nethercot, *Abraham Cowley: The Muse's Hannibal* (Oxford, 1931), p 237, and the second one in Grosart, I, lxxvii-viii

¹³ *The Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn, F. R. S.*, edited by William Bray, Esq (London and New York, n. d.), p 263

I find them now increased beyond the reach of my thanks by the present you have bin pleased to make mee of y^r most excellent and usefull Book, and more especially for the extraordinary honour you have done mee in adorning my Name wth the addresse of one part of it, and wth illustrious testimonies of y^r affection and esteem I am soe farre from repining at the iudgment of those Gentlemen who think it above my condition or desert, y^t noe man liveing can bee more Modest for me, then I find too much cause to bee for my selfe I designed noe other advantages by my Country Retreat but y^t of Quiet, and litle imagined the gaining of Fame too in the obscurity of it You have most liberally bestowed y^t upon mee and confirmed my love to this kind of Life, notwithstanding all the discouragements of Sicknes w^{ch} I have met wth hitherto I have had the ill fortune at my beginning to fall into an unhealthfull place but <in> recompence have gotten¹⁴ a freind who gives Immortality, for w^{ch}, and many other favours, (besides my great respects to y^r abilities and industry) I am

S^r,

Y^r most obliged and
most obedient Servant
A Cowley

Give me leave to present here my
most humble Service to y^r Lady, &
S^r R Brown

[Note in another hand on reverse side of page]

From M^r Cowley 7th Mar.

1663 $\frac{1}{4}$

upon my Dedication of
my Calendaria

55

111

HOWARD P. VINCENT

*Hillsdale College,
Hillsdale, Michigan*

TWO POEMS ASCRIBED TO ROCHESTER

The only reliable edition of Rochester's work is that edited by Rymer and published by Tonson in 1691. The poet's two modern editors have been forced to seek out other possibly Rochesterian verses in a mass of dubious poems, including forgeries, false attributions, and even poems by minor Elizabethans. Despite their best efforts, they have not always succeeded.¹ Of the two poems

¹⁴ Written above a scratched out word

¹ For example, John Hayward (*Collected Works of Rochester*, 1926) published as Rochester's two poems by Thomas Randolph "Upon Love

to be discussed here, neither appears in the edition of 1691, both have recently been ascribed to Rochester, and both, I am convinced, are the work of other writers.

The "Song" ("Since Death on all Lays his Impartial Hand") reprinted by Hayward as Rochester's,² was first attributed to Rochester by the publishers of the *Examen Miscellaneum* of 1702, Hayward's source. The poem does not appear in any of the early editions of Rochester's work. Hayward failed to note that, with minor textual variants, it is identical with Etherege's "The Libertine," first attributed to that poet in *Miscellaneous Works, written by His Grace, George, Late Duke of Buckingham*, 1704, whence Verity took it for his edition of Etherege.³ Although the two contemporary ascriptions seem to balance each other, and the final determination of authorship must be left to the future editor of Etherege, I am convinced that this is his work. Certainly it is much more in the limpid style of "gentle George" than the spirited force of Rochester.⁴

Hayward reprints, also, a poem entitled "The Imperfect Enjoyment," beginning "Fruition was the Question in Debate," and taken from *Miscellaneous Works of . . . Rochester and Roscommon*, 1707.⁵ The same poem, under the same title, is reprinted by Johns, but taken from *The Works of Rochester, Roscommon and Dorset*, etc., 1739.⁶ A casual reading suffices to show that this is merely a turgid paraphrase of Etherege's poem by the same title.

Fondly Refus'd for Conscience Sake," and a truncated version (134 lines) of "A Pastoral Courtship." G. Thorn-Drury, in his *Poems of Thomas Randolph*, 1929, pointed out the erroneous attribution. Similarly, Hayward reprinted as Rochester's three poems by Aphra Behn: "The Disappointment" ("One Day the Amorous Lysander"), "On A Juniper Tree Cut Down to Make Busks," and "On the Death of Mr Grenhill." That these were by Aphra Behn has been conclusively shown by Montague Summers in his edition of her works (1915, vi, 148, 151, 178). Quilter Johns reprinted all five poems as Rochester's in his edition of that poet in 1933.

² Hayward, 134-135.

³ A. Wilson Verity, *The Works of Sir George Etherege*, 1888, 399-400.

⁴ I acknowledge with gratitude my debt to H. F. B. Brett-Smith, whose edition of Etherege's poems is in preparation. Brett-Smith believes that "The Libertine" is "in all reasonable probability" by Etherege.

⁵ Hayward, 116.

⁶ Johns, 114. It is interesting to note that the verses appeared without an author's name in Dryden's *Miscellany Poems*, 4th ed., 1716, vol. iv, 187.

⁷ Cf. Verity, 397-399. There seems to be no doubt of Etherege's author-

Like *Etherege's* it is written in heroic couplets, it is forty-eight lines long to *Etherege's* fifty, it deals with the same erotic situation, the effect of excess passion, and it makes use of many of the figures and turns of thought used by *Etherege*.

It is difficult to believe that Rochester would have written so obvious, and so bad, an imitation of his friend's work. If he ever had so intended, the result would be, more plausibly, the poem commonly ascribed to Rochester, beginning, "Naked she lay, claspt in my longing Arms" In various early editions of Rochester's work, this poem is entitled "The Imperfect Enjoyment" or "The Disappointment"⁸ It is quite possible that the poem discussed here was written by some anonymous poetaster, and attracted into the Rochester canon by this duplication of themes and confusion of titles.

J. HAROLD WILSON

Ohio State University

THE WALPOLE-CHATTERTON CONTROVERSY

The details of the Walpole-Chatterton controversy have long since been presented and evaluated, much to Walpole's advantage, but additional verification will not, I believe, be unacceptable. The earliest account of the affair we have had from Walpole is his letter of May 23, 1778, to William Bewley, which is essentially the narrative Walpole later published as *Letter to the Editor of the Miscellanies of Thomas Chatterton* (1779) The first account appeared, however, after George Catcott had publicly implied that Walpole was responsible for Chatterton's failure, and the second, after the editor of *Miscellanies of Thomas Chatterton* had accused Walpole of causing Chatterton's death. Conceivably, therefore, one may be critical of Walpole's account, for the master of Strawberry Hill was eager to protect his public reputation. Most of the correspondence between Chatterton and Walpole has fortunately been preserved and bears out Walpole's story, but since the letter in which Walpole refused Chatterton's request for assistance has

ship here, Brett-Smith's evidence is conclusive The poem was first printed as *Etherege's* in 1693.

⁸ Hayward reprints it (71) under the first title, Johns (166) under the second.

not yet been recovered, we have had to rely upon Walpole's later account of his tenderness—an important point in the controversy

In one of his MS notebooks, however, Isaac Reed has preserved an account of the controversy as told him by Walpole three months before Catcott's indirect accusation. For essential matters, though perhaps not for details, it serves to substantiate Walpole's later account.

24 February 1777 I visited Mr Horace Walpole when he gave me the following Account of the Transaction between him and Chatterton That a Parcell came to his Bookseller directed to him inclosing a Poem (one of the Eclogues since published) and a Letter from Chatterton In the Letter the Writer of it informed him that he lived at Bristol was of Parents in low Circumstances one of whom only was living and that she had with difficulty & not with^t pinching herself been enabled to put him Clerk to an Attorney That he disliked his Profession & wished for some situation in which he might be[tt]er follow the bent of his Inclinations & Genius The Poem which he sent was pretended to be of the Age of Richard the first and to have been lent him by Mr Barret In the same Letter he likewise said that he could communicate to Mr Walpole if he had encouragement a series of Painters who had flourished at Bristol with a List of their Works This Mr Walpole thought impossible and having no belief in the Antiquity of the Poem suspected a Design of imposing upon him as an Antiquary by some Person who meant to hold him up to ridicule to the Publick However on Inquiry being satisfied that the Account Chatterton gave of himself was true he wrote to him a Letter in which he told him that he had no power to provide for him and recommended to him a diligent attention to his Profession which would enable him to pay the Debt of Gratitude he owed to his Mother & at the same time allow him to direct his attention to such pursuits as sho^d be most agreeable to him I do not recollect whether any more Letters passed before Chatterton desired the Mss might be returned to him This request coming just when Mr Walpole was about to set off for France was forgot to be complied with. Soon after Chatterton wrote him another Letter very scurrilous & impertinent in which among other things he said Mr W would not have dared to use him in such a manner if he had not been informed of his situation The Mss was then returned & the Correspondence ended Mr Walpole heard no more of Chatterton untill long after when dining with the Royal Academicians Dr Goldsmith was speaking of the Discovery which had been made at Bristol of Antient Poetry he enquired after his Correspondent & was told he was dead having poisoned himself for want Chatterton Dr Goldsmith said was a profligate abandoned young fellow & was at the time he killed himself almost destroyed by the Venereal Disorder and also was by his Companions distinguished by the Appellation of *the Villain* In the Letter Mr Walpole wrote to C he informed him that Mr Gray & Mason to whom he had shewn the Poem were of opinion it was not ancient.¹

¹ Folger MS 632

This account agrees substantially with Walpole's later comments, particularly in the matter of the missing second letter to Chatterton. Of similar importance is the account of Walpole's reason for being suspicious of Chatterton's intentions. In the *Letter* Walpole wrote, "At first I concluded that somebody having met with my *Anecdotes of Painting* had a mind to laugh at me" (p. 30), and Michael Loit later wrote that Walpole suspected a plan to subject him to public ridicule.² That Walpole truly feared public ridicule of his rather feeble antiquarianism, Reed's note seems to attest.

EARL R. WASSERMAN

The University of Illinois

THE REPUTE OF SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

The dislike of eighteenth-century critics for the sonnets of Shakespeare has been well illustrated by Professor Havens,¹ and the change in nineteenth-century critics to an attitude of greater appreciation of the poems is a familiar fact in literary history. It has not, however, been pointed out that there are three distinct stages in this change: a period during which the old condemnation persisted; a period during which appreciation grew but was not strong enough to win for the sonnet equal rank with Milton's; and a period in which their equality with Milton's was generally recognized.²

In the first period, 1800-1814, the sonnets received meager praise from critics, were not much reprinted in anthologies, and had no connection with the contemporary popularity of the Shakespearean form. Egerton Brydges, well read in Elizabethan literature, thought them "not among the best of . . . [Shakespeare's] minor

² Meyerstein, E. H. W., *Life of Thomas Chatterton* (New York, 1930), 269.

¹ R. D. Havens, *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass., 1922), pp. 480-2.

² Milton's sonnets, having been considered the finest English examples in the eighteenth century, continued to furnish a standard for comparison after 1800. See my "The Influence of Milton and Wordsworth on the Early Victorian Sonnet," *ELH*, v (1938), pp. 225-51, for their standing in the nineteenth century.

poems",³ Charles Symmons ranked them below Drummond's and then confessed his ignorance of sixteenth-century sonnets.⁴ The anthologists, Lofft and Henderson, held similar views, Lofft censuring Shakespeare's structure, Henderson not excepting him from a severe criticism of the earlier writers.⁵ Interest in Elizabethan literature was just rising, it was not yet too late for the *Critical Review* to credit Milton with the introduction of the sonnet to England.⁶ The strange dissociation between the popular elegiac rime scheme and Shakespeare's poems appears in Kirke White's failure to mention Shakespeare when arguing for the loose form.⁷

From 1813 or 1814 to 1830, the second period, the sonnets were often closely imitated and highly praised. Lord Thurlow anticipated Keats with poems which, in the externals of rime scheme and diction, approached Shakespeare's as nearly as the more famous poet's.⁸ Cornelius Webbe, John Hamilton Reynolds, and Thomas

³ Egerton Brydges and Joseph Haslewood, *The British Bibliographer* (1810-1814), iv, no 12, p 2

⁴ Charles Symmons, *The Life of John Milton* (1810), pp 270-1 and note

⁵ Capel Lofft, *Laura* (1814), I, III and CXCII, George Henderson, *Petrarca* (1803), pp VII-VIII. Lofft reprints only eight of Shakespeare's sonnets, Henderson only two.

⁶ *Critical Review*, 3d ser., VI (1805), 37

⁷ Kirke White, "Melancholy Hours, No V," *Remains*, ed Southey (1808), II, 249. Henderson, *op cit*, p XXX, championed the elegiac measure in spite of his condemnation of early sonnets, and the *Critical Review*, 2d ser., XXXIV (1802), 393, supported its plea for this form by citing the success not of Shakespeare but of the sentimental Charlotte Smith.

⁸ The following is a typical example from Lord Thurlow's *Poems on Several Occasions*, 2d ed (1813)

SAY nothing, that, to save thy lightest pain,
I willingly from out this World would pass,
Though there indeed my loss must be my gain,
That for a while must dwell from thee, alas!
No, even as thyself thy friends are dear;
Whatever thou hast lov'd from youth till now,
Is lov'd of me, and in affection near,
And for their safety I record my vow
Never believe, that I am dull at heart,
When hazard shall be made of thee, and thine,
But with a perfect soul, and not in part,
I freely will this balmy an resign
O, think but this, whatever love has dar'd,
For thy sweet sake shall of my love be heir'd

Hood followed the examples of Loid Thurlow and Keats. Praise was bestowed on the poems by the younger Boswell, who apologized for Malone's unenthusiastic defense of them and said that their merits were "now . . . almost universally acknowledged",⁹ and by Nathan Drake, who forgot the strictures he had passed in 1798 and defended them vigorously.¹⁰ Keats, Wordsworth, and Beddoes were of course enthusiastic about them.¹¹ Three editions of Shakespeare's *Poems* were issued between 1819 and 1831, the time, perhaps, when Elizabethan influence on the sonnet was strongest. On the other hand, the dislike of Elizabethan ornateness continued, for an article in the *Retrospective Review* recommended Shakespeare's non-dramatic poetry but found the sonnets "defective" and concluded that "the best writer of English Sonnets is . . . Milton."¹² The familiar faint praise of the sonnets, "the best . . . anterior to . . . Drummond,"¹³ is to be found as late as 1828, and Hazlitt remained hostile.

The appearance of the *Sonnets of Shakespeare and Milton* in 1830 marks the final stage. After this year critics commonly coupled the two names as those of the masters of the English sonnet, and one periodical even argued that Shakespeare's poems possessed more of the "real character of the sonnet" than Milton's or

⁹ Boswell's Malone (1821), xx, 222 (cf. 363). Malone had at the end of the eighteenth century defended them against George Steevens, who had considered them inferior to those of Watson.

¹⁰ See Nathan Drake, *Shakespeare and His Times* (1817), II, 74-86, cf. Nathan Drake, *Literary Hours*, 3d ed. (1804), I, 107-8. The reviewer of the 1817 work in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, LXXXVIII, pt. 2 (1818), 335, emphatically agreed with Drake in his new opinion.

¹¹ See Keats' letter to J. H. Reynolds, November 22, 1817, Wordsworth's "Essay Supplementary to the Preface, 1815," *Prose Works*, ed. Knight, II, 234; Beddoes' letter to Thomas Forbes Kelsall, May 13, 1827. Wordsworth's less favorable remarks about the sonnets in his letter to Sir William Rowan Hamilton, November 22, 1831, may be discounted, they refer to the structure of the sonnets and are in answer to Hamilton's attempt to justify the illegitimate structure of his own sonnets by Shakespeare's example (Hamilton to Wordsworth, November 17, 1831).

¹² *Retrospective Review*, VII (1823), 393. The author criticized the "coldness and quaintness about [the sonnets of] Daniel, Drummond, and Sir Philip Sidney." The *New Monthly*, VII (1823), 473-6, attacked both Shakespeare's and Sidney's sonnets.

¹³ *New Monthly*, XXVI (1828), 582.

Wordsworth's¹⁴ The anthologists Dyce and Woodford printed more sonnets by Shakespeare than by any other writer¹⁵ Symbolic of Shakespeare's gains is Julian Fane's shift from imitation of Milton to imitation of Shakespeare¹⁶ Brydges objected, in 1835, that Shakespeare's sonnets had been praised too much, but they were still to be spoken of warmly by Elizabeth Barrett Browning and Edward Fitzgerald¹⁷ Almost for the first time since Keats' experiments, the structure used by Shakespeare had some influence, and had it because of the connection with Shakespeare¹⁸ Thomas Campbell, Landor, and Hallam made adverse criticisms of the poems, yet Hallam admitted that "No one ever entered more fully than Shakespeare into the character of this species of poetry"¹⁹ Compared to its position in 1805 or even in 1820,

¹⁴ *Rugby Magazine*, I (1835), 149 Other periodicals which mention Milton and Shakespeare as equals are *Gentleman's Magazine*, CIII, pt 1 (1833), 618, and *Athenaeum*, May 2, 1835, p 337

¹⁵ A Dyce, *Specimens of English Sonnets* (1833), Montagu A Woodford, *Book of Sonnets* (1841) Dyce, in the notes to his anthology and in his "Memoir of Shakespeare" prefixed to the Aldine edition of Shakespeare's works, gave the sonnets high praise

¹⁶ See Robert Bulwer-Lytton, *Julian Fane* (London, 1872), pp 117 ff It was around 1860 that Fane turned to the Shakespearean model

¹⁷ Milton *Poetical Works*, ed Brydges (Boston, 1855), p xciv, E B Browning, "The Book of the Poets," *Poetical Works* (London, 1932), p. 627, Fitzgerald to Archdeacon Allen, November [27, 1832] Brydges' Milton first appeared in 1835, Mrs Browning's essay in 1842 Fitzgerald was particularly appreciative "I have been reading Shakespeare's Sonnets

I had but half an idea of him, Demigod as he seemed before, till I read them carefully . . . [They] are perfectly simple, and have the very essence of tenderness that is only to be found in the best parts of his Romeo and Juliet besides" Cf. Coleridge's praise in *Table Talk and Omniana*, ed T Ashe (1896), pp 221-2 (dated May 14, 1833).

¹⁸ Mrs Caroline Norton in *The Dream, and Other Poems* (New York, 1847), p 226, argued that the Shakespearean form was "a better English model than that adopted by Milton," pointing out that Shakespeare had evidently considered such a form a true sonnet form, Sir William Rowan Hamilton (letter to Wordsworth, November 17, 1831) cited Shakespeare's rime scheme to excuse his own deviation from the legitimate structure Although the legitimate form was predominant in theory and practise before 1850, later there were critics who considered the Shakespearean form as correct as the Italian Cf *Dublin Review*, n s XXVII (1876), 422, William Sharp, *Sonnets of This Century* (1886-1887), p lii, T Hall Caine, *Sonnets of Three Centuries* (1882), pp ix ff

¹⁹ Arthur Henry Hallam, *Introduction to the Literature of Europe* (New

critical opinion may be seen to have shifted toward a new, high estimate of Shakespeare's sonnets

GEORGE SANDERLIN

The University of Maine

FRANKLIN AND WILLIAM PENN'S *NO CROSS, NO CROWN*

The eighty-first number of *The New-England Courant* for the week of 11-18 February 1723 was the second number of the paper published under the name of Benjamin Franklin, after his brother, James, had ostensibly renounced his editorship because of a prohibitive decree of the Massachusetts Council. The leading article of this issue is an amusing satire on honorary titles, and has been accepted by modern biographers as the work of Franklin Fay, for example, quotes from it as "an article certainly written by the younger Franklin,"¹ and Van Doren asserts that it "must have been" by him.² Apparently, however, no one has noticed that it is a burlesque of a section from the ninth chapter of William Penn's *No Cross, No Crown* (1669).

The essay purports to be a record of a session of the club to which the new editor of the *Courant*, Benjamin Franklin, belongs. During the course of the meeting, one of the members had read "some Passages from a zealous Author against *Hatt-Honour*, *Titular Respects*, etc" This phrase will be recognized as part of the long sub-title of Penn's work, *No Cross, No Crown or several Sober Reasons Against Hat-Honour, Titular-Respects, You to a single Person, with the Apparel and Recreations of the Times . . .*

The passages which the member of the club supposedly quoted are, of course, not actually from Penn's very serious treatise, as the

York, 1880), III, 254 The other references are Shakespeare, *Dramatic Works*, ed Thomas Campbell (London, 1866), pp XLVI-XLVII, Landor, "Southey and Landor," *Works* (London, 1876), IV, 512, and "Southey and Porson," *Works*, IV, 56 Campbell's Shakespeare first appeared in 1838, Hallam's work from 1837 to 1839

¹ Bernard Fay, *Franklin, the Apostle of Modern Times*, Boston, 1929, p 58

² Carl Van Doren, *Benjamin Franklin*, New York, 1938, p 31 Of James Parton, *Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin*, New York, etc, 1864, I, 93.

exaggerated absurdity of the ruse indicates. The fictitious quotation in *The New-England Courant* runs as follows

In old Time it was no disrespect for Men and Women to be call'd by their own Names. *Adam*, was never called *Master Adam*, we never read of *Noah Esquire*, *Lot Knight* and *Baronet*, nor the *Right Honourable* *Abraham*, *Viscount* *Mesopotamia*, *Baron* of *Canaan*, no, no, they were plain Men, honest Country *Grasiers*, that took Care of their Families and their Flocks. *Moses* was a great Prophet, and *Aaron* a Priest of the Lord, but we never read of the *Reverend* *Moses*, nor the *Right Reverend Father in God*, *Aaron*, by Divine Providence, *Lord Arch-Bishop* of *Israel*

Penn's attack on titles of respect, in *No Cross, No Crown*, actually reads thus

For if we read the Scriptures, such a Thing as *My Lord Adam*, (though Lord of the World) is not to be found. Nor *My Lord Noah* neither, the *Second Lord* of the Earth. Nor yet *My Lord Abraham*, the Father of the Faithful, nor *My Lord Isaac*, nor *My Lord Jacob*. But much less *My Lord Peter*, and *My Lord Paul*, to be found in the Bible. And less *Your Holiness*, or *Your Grace* ³

Franklin has obviously elaborated on the idea in order to make it ridiculous, but the paraphrase is sufficiently close to Penn's statement to indicate that the latter is the source of the parody. It is especially significant that the choice of the first three names, Adam, Noah and Abraham (with the exception of Franklin's insertion of Lot) is the same in each case.

It seems impossible to discover exactly how Franklin came to know Penn's *No Cross, No Crown*. Perhaps it was one of the books he purchased with "the little money that came into my hands," or it may have been one of the "books in polemic divinity" in his father's library.⁴ It might also have been lent him by one of the booksellers' apprentices, or Mr Matthew Adams, from whom he frequently borrowed "such books as I chose to read."⁵

A. STUART PITT

New Haven, Connecticut

³ *A Collection of the Works of William Penn*, London, 1726, I, 324

⁴ *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, ed A H Smyth, New York, 1905-7, I, 238 (*Autobiography*).

⁵ *Ibid*, p 239.

DAVID MALLOCH AND *THE EDINBURGH
MISCELLANY*

Several poets of distinction in the eighteenth century entered the field through the pages of the miscellanies. Such collections, containing as they did pieces of a heterogeneous nature—many printed anonymously,—were an ideal medium for ambitious young poets. David Malloch (he had not yet changed his name to 'Mallet') made his bow to the World in *The Edinburgh Miscellany*.¹ His connection with this volume is not unknown, but is obscure.² In the *Miscellany* there is a poem by "a Youth in his Fifteenth Year" and three others signed "D M" all "By the same hand." There can be little doubt that these are by Malloch. One of them is "A Pastoral, Inscrib'd to Mr. M——l." Malloch wrote to John Ker: "The 'Edinburgh Miscellany' was undertaken by an 'Athenian Society' here, who received the poems [Malloch's], and published all they thought worthy of seeing the light. The gentleman to whom I inscrib'd my *Pastoral* is one of their number. His name is Mr. Joseph Mitchell."³

In the four poems Malloch conforms to the taste of his time. The "Pastoral" (pp. 223-8) is followed by another sylvan piece, "The Grove, or Interview" (pp. 232-3). "Chapter II. of Solomon's Song" (pp. 229-31) was obviously written as a love poem, not as an expression of religious feeling. It points to the "Epithalamium on The Marriage of a Friend" (pp. 259-63), which contains some lusciously amorous lines, the more amazing coming from a boy of fifteen. But instead of revealing that Malloch was already an ex-

¹ Volume One was published at Edinburgh in 1720. A second volume was announced, but apparently never appeared. The book is very scarce, the only copy I know of in this country being at the Columbia University Library.

² The *DNB* (xxv, p. 425) mentions the *Edinburgh* and one of the poems, but has obviously been content with Malloch's account as given in a letter to John Ker, quoted below. Even his most conscientious biographer, Frederick Dinsdale (*Ballads and Songs by David Mallet*, London, 1857, p. 19 n) adds nothing new about the *Miscellany*.

³ *European Magazine*, xxiii (1793), p. 338. Until the publication of part of the Malloch-Ker correspondence (October, 1720-July, 1727) in the *European*, thirty-three years after Malloch's death, little was known about his early life. The letters were reprinted by Robert Anderson, in *The Works of the British Poets* (London, 1795), ix, 669-70.

perienced follower of Venus it merely is another example of his following the fashion of the time

The young David was but one flower in a Child's Garden of Weises For "A C," who wrote the Preface to the *Miscellany*, pointed out with pride that he was introducing a new set of future Drydens, and pleaded for a kind reception In this volume James Thomson attempts to win his spurs "J C., a Youth of Fifteen, at the University," has six poems to his credit Well represented also are The Young Ladies of the Fair Intellectual Club, one of whom begs her audience

My first Essay in pastoral Excuse,
Indulge my Genius, and protect my Muse (p 183)

Finally, Malloch tells us, in one of the Ker letters, that the five poems ascribed to "S." are by "Mr Symmers, a boy of fifteen, and very sprightly"

RICHARD BOYS

Baltimore, Maryland

REVIEWS

Machiavelli's Prince and its Forerunners. The Prince as a typical book De Regimine Principum. By ALLEN H GILBERT. Durham, N. C.. Duke University Press, 1938. Pp. xiii + 266. \$3.00.

It was an English scholar—L. Arthur Burd—who gave a notable contribution to the study of Machiavelli's sources by showing the change that certain ideas of Aristotle underwent in passing through the agile mind of the Florentine. Now Prof. Gilbert has considerably extended the scope of Burd's (and other scholars') researches by including not only the Aristotelian tradition in the Middle Ages (Gilbert is also the author of a study of *Dante's Conception of Justice*), but also what must amount to practically all treatises on the duties of a prince composed in western Europe up to the time of Machiavelli. By means of a wealth of quotation and exact reference, Gilbert is able to show the background of Machiavelli's brief treatise chapter by chapter, and sometimes almost sentence by sentence. After Gilbert's exhaustive and well-digested presentation of evidence, it is impossible not to realise, in full detail, the outstand-

ing difference between Machiavelli's revolutionary realism, which was to shock the conscience of Europe for more than a century, and the tame ethical commonplaces and copy-book maxims of his predecessors. They were never able to free themselves from the purely deontological distinction between the "good" prince and the bad tyrant (though Gilbert shows that in practice they were forced to compromise), while Machiavelli based his distinction of good and bad princes simply on the capacity to hold power, whether the means used were ethically laudable or not. The issues thus raised are still the subject of debate.

Gilbert is also able to correct Burd on some points of detail, such as the interpretation of the word "*uno*" in chapter 3 of the *Prince* (p. 31). Gilbert rightly interprets it, in that context, as "*alcuno*," *anyone*, and not the numeral *one*. On the other hand, reference to Luigi Russo's commentary on the *Prince* shows that "*correggere*" in chapter 7 and elsewhere (p. 43) has frequently the sense of *to govern*, pure and simple. Russo's study follows in the great tradition of de Sanctis' and Croce's interpretation of Machiavelli, while Dilthey's inquiries into Machiavelli's indebtedness to Polybius throw much light on such important questions as the Florentine's attitude to monarchy and republicanism, and the relation of ethics to politics. It is doubtful whether Gilbert would have found much to add by referring to von Mohl's vast but outdated repository of learning, or Ch. Benoist's *Le Machiavélisme avant Machiavel* (1907), which is more concerned with political practice than with political theory. A final word of praise must also be given to the illustrations and to the very full index.

N. ORSINI

University of Florence, Italy

Inkle and Yarico. Album selected and arranged by LAWRENCE MARSDEN PRICE. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1937. Pp. 171. \$2.50.

Il s'agit bien en effet d'un album, d'une série de vignettes illustrant des légendes anglaises, françaises et allemandes et non de l'analyse et de l'étude systématiques d'un thème. Partant du fait apparemment authentique relaté par le voyageur Ligon, en 1657, dans sa *True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados*, M. Price a collectionné avec le soin d'un amateur d'estampes les variantes sentimentales et philosophiques, prêcheuses et indignées qu'il a rencontrées au cours de son enquête à travers trois littératures européennes. Il a retrouvé des traductions en italien, en espagnol, en danois, en hollandais et en latin. Il a étudié avec soin ce qui les distingue, il a marqué les variantes et les emprunts. Il n'a pas

non plus négligé de reproduire en entier quelques pièces rares, onze gravures et pages de titres qui constituent les "embellishments" de son ouvrage. Livre précieux pour les amateurs d'exotisme, l'album est présenté avec un soin typographique trop rare et a droit à une place à part dans nos bibliothèques d'étude. Avec les matériaux qu'il avait découverts, M. Price aurait pu composer un gros volume et "épuiser" le sujet. Qu'il soit loué de ne pas l'avoir fait; mais sa trop grande modestie l'a conduit à se limiter à une présentation un peu sèche qui pourrait conduire le lecteur non averti à "sous-estimer" la valeur et l'importance de ce travail. Ne pouvant tout dire, je me bornerai à quelques points qui me semblent essentiels. Le premier pas est franchi avec la version donnée par Steele, dans le *Spectator*, en 1711. Le récit de Ligon ne dépassait guère la portée d'un fait divers atroce. Un matelot naufragé est recueilli par une jeune indigène qui devient sa maîtresse. Quand, de longs mois plus tard, il est retrouvé par un vaisseau anglais et qu'il rentre dans la civilisation, il vend comme esclave, pour se procurer des ressources, celle qui lui avait sauvé la vie. "And so poor Yarico for her love, lost her liberty." Steele déjà transforme considérablement le récit du simple annaliste. Chez lui nous trouvons déjà une sorte de robinsonnade, la description détaillée de la grotte où se réfugient les deux amants, quelque couleur locale, les promesses trompeuses d'Inkle, des souvenirs des idylles antiques, un décor de pastorale, la poésie de la nuit et le chant du rossignol, sans compter une ironie froide du narrateur. Le fait divers, le "fait de vie" est entré dans la littérature. Il n'était peut-être pas inutile de le faire remarquer. Avec Dorat et surtout avec Chamfort, en France, l'anecdote revêt une signification entièrement différente.

Encore ici conviendrait-il peut-être d'ajouter un supplément d'information à l'enquête conduite par M. Price. Selon les *Mémoires secrets de la République des Lettres* (26 juillet 1765), Dorat et Chamfort se seraient inspirés d'une héroïde intitulée *Cléone à Cynéas*, publiée pour la première fois en 1759 et dont la seconde édition parut en 1764, à Leipsick, dans le recueil "*Moralische Briefe zur Bildung des Herzens etc.*" Mais ils seraient "restés bien au-dessous de l'original du côté du naturel et de ce sentiment triste et profond qui empreint chaque ligne de l'allemand." Je n'ai pu consulter cet original, mais on en trouvera la traduction dans la *Gazette littéraire de l'Europe*, VI, 174, 15 juillet 1765. L'auteur allemand, "M. Dusch," a en tout cas généralisé l'anecdote, supprimé toute couleur locale, donné une couleur ovidienne aux plaintes de la pauvre délaissée qui, au lieu d'une simple sauvagesse, devient une fille-mère abandonnée par un perfide amant. C'est, en tout cas, vers cette date qu'apparaît simultanément en Allemagne, en Angleterre et en France un des thèmes essentiels de l'exotisme sentimental, le thème du départ et de la séparation inévitable. Déjà est esquissé le problème fondamental qui trouble les idylles

coloniales dont sont victimes tant de "petites épouses" dans les romans modernes. Dans son dernier chapitre qui a pour titre *In Memoriam*, M. Price s'est attaché à retracer l'histoire littéraire de la postérité d'Yarico. Il avait sans doute les meilleurs raisons du monde pour s'arrêter aux environs de 1810. Il n'en est pas moins certain que la pauvre Indienne vendue à la Baibade par une ingrate brute est une ancêtre lointaine, mais authentique, de Rarahu et de la Fatou Gaye de Loti.

GILBERT CHINARD

Princeton University

Uhtred de Boldon, Friar Wilham Jordan, and "Piers Plowman"

By MILDRED ELIZABETH MARCETT. Published by the Author, New York University, 1938. Pp. vii + 75.

This dissertation stirs the ashes of mediaeval religious controversy in England and brings to life the half forgotten figures of Uhtred de Boldon, Benedictine monk, and William Jordan, preaching friar. Each in his day was a personage and deserves to be remembered among the theologians who illuminated the fourteenth century.

More is known of Uhtred than of William. Called 'perhaps the greatest and most interesting of Durham monk-scholars,' Uhtred was, successively, Oxford scholar; Warden of Durham College, Oxford, Prior of Finchale, a cell of Durham, ambassador of Edward III to Pope Urban V at Avignon; and Sub-prior of Durham. He died January 28, 1396.

Of the events in William Jordan's life little is known. He was long connected with the Papal Court, and in 1358 became Prior of the House of Friar Preachers at York. His great activity was in religious controversy that brought him in conflict, among others, with Wycliffe and Uhtred. The question at issue between them was the familiar one of the relative value of grace and works as means of salvation. Jordan, who appears to have had Pelagian leanings, charged the orthodox Uhtred with heresy, because Uhtred set grace above works. To this charge Uhtred replied in a tract 'Contra Querelas Fratrum,' here printed in full from MS. Royal 6 D x. It is described in part as follows (pp. 38, 39).

The tract *Contra querelas fratrum* is interesting, quite apart from its biographical and controversial importance, because it deals with some of the most discussed theological questions of its day. Probably the most important of these is the necessity for divine grace. Uhtred discusses the subject in articles fourteen to twenty. Briefly, his doctrine is that no grace can be equal in value to that which is given unmerited, that grace without which the pilgrim cannot obtain heaven. This grace is higher in nature than any obtained by works, and is necessary for the performance of any act of merit. This grace is required as much for the state of innocence as for the state of sin. These ideas seem to be strictly orthodox, and it is

difficult to understand why Uhtred should have been attacked for them. But they were contrary to the ideas widely held by the followers of the Pelagian heresy. It is obvious that Jordan must have been an upholder of at least part of this heresy, since his ideas did not agree with those of Uhtred.

The ideas held by Uhtred did agree with those held by Wycliffe, the author of the *Pearl*, and the author of *Piers Plowman* (p. 48). That the author of *Piers Plowman* held Pelagianism and its advocate William Jordan in supreme contempt may be accepted as a fact, if Miss Marcett is correct when she suggests that Jordan was the original of the Doctor or 'maister' who dines at the house of Conscience (*Piers Plowman*, B-text, Passus XIII, lines 21-221). The identification of Langland's remarkably realistic figure with the Dominican Jordan turns in the main upon a proper understanding of lines 83, 84:

'I shal Iangle to this Jurdan with his Iust wombe,
To telle me what penaunce is of which he preched rather.'

To Skeat a modern rendering of these lines would begin:

'I shall argue with this chamber-pot. (*Piers Plowman*, II, 192),

but Miss Marcett would begin them.

'I shall argue with this William Jordan. . .

On the ground of good sense the second rendering is better if evidence for such a rendering is forthcoming. Such evidence is found in the poet's undoubted intention of making the Doctor himself a Dominican (Passus XIII, 70, 73-4, 93-4), and his attribution to him of certain personal traits, such as pomposity and fondness for argument and casuistical subtleties, that characterized William Jordan himself.

To the student of mediaeval literature and history the restoration to their proper places of Uhtred and of William will be welcome, but more important is the identification with a real person of another of Langland's brilliant portraits. The whole business of hunting up 'originals,' whether for the characters of Chaucer's Prologue or for the allegorical figures in *Piers Plowman*, is hazardous at best. Credit belongs to this attempt for its thoroughness and for the modesty with which the results are presented. We agree with the author that she has made an 'extremely plausible conjecture.'

COOLIDGE OTIS CHAPMAN

College of Puget Sound

The History of the English Novel, Vol. IX, *The Day Before Yesterday*. By ERNEST A BAKER. London H F and G Witherby, 1938. Pp. 364 16 Sh.

It is a pleasure to find that so much critical discrimination and flexibility of mind can go with so much learning as in this penultimate volume of Baker's history of the novel. One might anticipate that an author who had done ample justice to the Elizabethans, to Richardson and Sterne, to Scott and Dickens and Trollope—not to speak of the countless minor figures through more than four centuries—would tire at length and rest content in the formulas so far developed by English genius. Not so with this historian. The prodigious task already accomplished of reading, relishing and interpreting has left him with as fresh a mind as ever—as open to new impressions and eager to trace the extensions of imaginative sensibility into regions uncharted by our classic novelists. He does not even stop with the less extreme departures of the writers studied. He has as warm appreciation of *Jude the Obscure* as of *The Return of the Native*. He is more enthusiastic over *The Golden Bowl* and *The Brook Kerith* than over *The American* and *Esther Waters*. And he devotes his subtlest powers of analysis to those developments of feeling and technique which carry the art of fiction farthest beyond the point where it rested in the age of Fielding or the age of Meredith. He has the nicest apprehension of the individual genius which enables each one of the greater writers, and of some less great, to fashion and color a world of his own as distinct and plausible as any of the worlds in which men actually find themselves living. And he is particularly apt at tracing the degrees of power possessed by different novelists to captivate and convince. One of the most remarkable of his studies is that of Gissing, whose seriousness and energy and command of his subject-matter present us with the teasing problem of why he should have failed to create a thoroughly satisfying world of seemings. Gissing's want of humor, of the zest of life, of sympathy for his "nether world", his abstract conception of character; his bookish dialogue; his old-fashioned technique of plotting and specification—these are some of the points adduced by Mr. Baker to account for his failure. There is not space to discuss our critic's occasional lapses from complete adequacy—his neglect to define "realism" in connection with the early work of Moore, his rather conventional references to Zola, his assumption that Hardy's "determinism" in *The Dynasts* can or should affect our sense of tragedy in his novels. It is much more important to attest the almost infallible justice of his appraisals and of his assignment of esthetic reasons for them.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

The University of Minnesota

BRIEF MENTION

Cosimo de' Medici, Pater Patriae, 1389-1464 By CURT S. GUTKIND Oxford Clarendon Press [New York. Oxford University Press], 1938. Pp 340 This volume makes hard reading but contains useful information and well-considered judgments. Like the numerous appendices, the introductory survey of the Florentine commonwealth resembles rather a collection of notes than an integrated exposition, and even the narrative of Florentine politics on the eve of Medician dominance lacks perspective. Only in the sections where the author has been able to make Cosimo dominate his background does the story come to life. The *Pater Patriae* is presented with understanding sympathy and frankly expressed admiration but without adulation and with only very light touches of "whitewash." How Cosimo acquired his international reputation, how he used his international connections to strengthen his position at home, and how he maintained himself not only by manipulating the political machinery of Florence but also by conciliating the prejudices and ambitions of the Florentines—these questions are fully and ably dealt with. The connections between Cosimo's business transactions and his political activity is a more difficult problem which the author fails to solve in spite of an elaborate survey of the business net work of the Medici. "Cosimo was above all a merchant and a banker" (p. 108). We would therefore like to see his mind at work on a business problem, as we do see it at work on the problems of diplomacy and of domestic politics. Yet, in view of the nature of the sources, it may be unfair to criticize the failure to resurrect this part of Cosimo's thinking. Certainly Mr. Gutkind has tried and has canvassed a very wide range of writings for aid. In the printing, however, of the very useful bibliography there are a number of curious slips: for example, Fanfoni for Fanfani (p. 322), Sayons for Sayous (p. 331), and Randolph, G. for Richards, G. R. B. (p. 329).

FREDERIC C. LANE

The Johns Hopkins University

Sara Coleridge and Henry Reed Edited by LESLIE NATHAN BROUGHTON. (Cornell Studies in English, vol. xxvii.) Ithaca, N. Y.: University Press Pp. xviii + 117. \$1.50. This small volume is devoted primarily to Sara, the daughter of S. T. Coleridge, the wife of H. N. Coleridge, and the mother of Herbert Coleridge of the *New English Dictionary*. It includes a useful brief memoir of Sara by Henry Reed, professor of rhetoric and English literature at the

University of Pennsylvania, six long letters of Sara written to Reed, two unpublished as a whole and the others unpublished in part; some interesting comments by Sara on Reed's *Memoir of Gray*, again partly unpublished, and finally a few rather disappointing marginalia by Sara on Christopher Wordsworth's *Memoirs of William Wordsworth*, interesting chiefly when Sara speaks of the Wordsworth children. The letters are the heart of the book, especially the sixteen-page fifth letter, with its disparaging comment on Christopher Wordsworth. But everything in this volume adds to our knowledge of Sara's noble character and high intelligence.

THOMAS M. RAYSOR

The University of Nebraska

Bibliography of Courtesy and Conduct Books in Seventeenth-century England. By GERTRUDE E. NOYES, New Haven [Printed for the author by Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor] 1937. Pp. iv + 111. Miss Noyes's work does not aim at being an all-inclusive, "definitive" bibliography—a type possible only after many scholars have labored in a field,—nor does it confine itself to being merely "selective." Rather, it is what may be termed an "exploratory" bibliography, which in scope goes far beyond the "selective" type, making accessible the titles of a very considerable number of books discovered in a fruitfully intensive search. As such, the bibliography is a highly creditable piece of work. Although admittedly not exhaustive (it is perhaps unfortunate that the author excluded additional items available from John E. Mason's *Gentlefolk in the Making* (1935), on the ground that her work had already taken shape when Mr. Mason's book appeared), the bibliography does, as the author hopes it will, "convey some suggestion of the great mass of courtesy and conduct literature which flooded England in the seventeenth century." She has listed most of the important works in the field, and has included, besides, a great number of out-of-the-way and curious works which scholars will be glad to know about. A classified index has been added, which enables one to see at a glance how important, in bulk, are certain types—translations, "characters," dialogues, satires, etc.—and what books discuss various topics, e. g. education, politics, "honor," travel, etc. Much effort has gone into listing as many editions as possible of works published throughout the century.

W. LEE USTICK

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIV

NOVEMBER, 1939

Number 7

"A GOVERNOUR WILY AND WYS"

Hunting monks seem to have been common in Chaucer's time,¹ but only one is known to be on record, William de Cloune, abbot of Leicester, and he has escaped the notice of editors of Chaucer.² This paper studies the Monk in the *Canterbury Tales* using Cloune as an example.³

The abbey chronicler says that Cloune was "the most famous and notable hunter of hares among all the lords of the realm, so that the King himself, his son Prince Edward, and many lords of the realm were bound under a yearly pension to hunt with him."⁴ As with the Monk,

Of prikyng and of huntynge for the hare
Was al his lust⁵

¹ G. M. Trevelyan, *Age of Wyclif* (London, 1904), p. 159, citing the Monk and passages in *Piers Plowman* and the *Vow Clamantis*.

² Cloune is noticed only by A. H. Thompson, "Monasteries of Leicestershire in the fifteenth century," *Transactions of the Leicestershire archaeological society*, xi (Leicester, 1913), 98 ff. No editor of Chaucer has ever cited any contemporary example in illustration of the Monk.

³ The material used in this article is almost all in print,—the brief biography of the abbot in the Leicester chronicle and some of the chronicler's record sources which are accessible in the calendars of the rolls, the abbey records in Thomas Hearne's appendix to John Nichols' *History and antiquities of the county of Leicester* (London, 1795-1815), and the borough records. All the earlier abbey muniments had disappeared before Hearne's time, only some of the late fifteenth century compilations of William Charite survive. See note 47.

⁴ Henry Knighton, *Chronicon*, ed. J. R. Lumby (Rolls series, London, 1889-95), II, 127. "In venatione leporum inter omnes regni dominos famosissimus et nominatissimus habebatur, ita ut ipse rex, et princeps filius ejus Edwardus, et plures domini de regno cum eo retenti erant sub annua pensione leporare."

⁵ *Canterbury Tales*, lines 191-2

But the abbot often declared in private that it was not these "frivolities" that he enjoyed so much as paying deference to the wishes of his noble patrons and having the benefits of their patronage.⁶ The chief of the nobles who hunted with King Edward III at Leicester was the duke of Lancaster, the patron of the abbey, and he and the King made a favorite of the abbot. "God gave him such grace in the eyes of all," remarks the abbey chronicler, "that scarcely any one ever denied him anything he asked,"⁷ and he asked for manors, endowments, churches and chapels, increments, exemptions, dispensations, even—in jest—for a license to hold a greyhound fair at the abbey. The King responded with a formal grant.⁸ The duke made petitions to the King and the pope in the abbey's behalf,⁹ and imparked the abbey wood and stocked it with deer out of Leicester Forest.¹⁰ Cloune was abbot from November, 1345 to his death in January, 1378, and the King's grants are dated 1347, 1351, 1352, 1357, 1361, 1363, 1366, and 1370, Edward was especially generous in 1352—the year the duke imparked the abbey wood—and in 1363.¹¹ This was Edward's

⁶ Knighton, II, 127 "Ipse tamen saepius voluit asserere in secretis, se non delectasse in hujusmodi frivolis venationibus nisi solum pro obsequiis domini regni praestandis, et affabilitate eorum captanda et gratiam in suis negotiis adipiscenda."

⁷ *Loc cit* "Isti benigno abbati Willelmo deus tantam gratiam in oculis omnium tam dominorum quam aliorum contulit, quod vix erat aliquis qui ei quod petebat negaret."

⁸ *Loc cit* "In tantum enim affabilis erat domino regi, quod burdando petebat a rege mundinas sibi concedi pro leporariis et aliis canibus cujuscumque conditionis essent emendis et vendendis. Rex vero credens ipsum mundinas affectuose petisse, ei concessit quod petebat, abbas vero noluit instare circa negotium."

⁹ *Calendar of the patent rolls of Edward III*, IX, 146, and *Calendar of entries in the papal registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Petitions to the Pope*, I, 226

¹⁰ Knighton, II, 74

¹¹ *Calendar of the patent rolls of Edward III*, VII, 430, grant of lands, 1347; IX, 146, license to appropriate Hungarton church, 1351, IX, 269 and 230, grant of lands including Ingwardby, the abbey's best grange, and exemption of the abbot from attending Parliament, 1352, X, 576, license to enclose a way enlarging the abbey woods, 1357, XII, 99, grant of the manor of Kirkby Mallory and the advowson of the manor church, 1361, XII, 413 and 415, provision for the maintenance of two monks at the university, and exemption of the abbey from delivery into the hands of the King's escheator on the death of the abbot, 1363, XIII, 4, pardon to Henry Knighton at the

jubilee year and he hunted "through the forests of Rogyngnam, Clyve, and Schyrevode, and other forests, parks, and woods," including Leicester Forest, for the chronicler mentions the King's presence at the abbey. He had three royal guests, the kings of France, Scotland, and Cyprus,¹² the same Peter of Cyprus whose "tragedie" is told in the *Monk's Tale*. Frequent royal visits are implied in the abbot's yearly pension. Then, too, the journey to York or Scotland was customarily broken at Leicester,¹³ for instance, King Edward was at the abbey for four days in July, 1336, on his way to Scotland, and the Queen was there about two weeks later on her return from the North.¹⁴ Edward's visits are not easily traced in the records, however, after the first decade of his reign.¹⁵ He was at Leicester for three days before Christmas in 1345 for the funeral of the earl Henry, and he was invited to the duke Henry's funeral in March, 1361. The borough made presents to the King's fool in 1357-8 and to the King's archers in 1358-9,¹⁶ probably on the occasion of the marriage of Blanche of Lancaster and John of Gaunt. The King dated his letters patent and close at Leicester in January, 1346, and Parliament met there in 1349. As for the duke, the borough accounts record

instance of the abbot, 1370, *Calendar of the close rolls*, XII, 222-3, restoration of Cockerham in Lancashire to the abbey, 1366. Further acquisitions of lands are mentioned by Knighton, II, 126, and two suits won by the abbot, by Knighton, II, 112-3, and Nichols, I, 285. The King's pardon to Walter Wynkeburne (see below note 12) would date the King's presence at the abbey in 1363 but is not in the printed calendars of the rolls.

¹² Knighton, II, 118-9, his presence is mentioned as a circumstance incidental to the pardon of a man who survived hanging at Leicester. The chaplain of the King of France wrote a treatise on hunting, W and F. Baillie-Grohman, "A French king's hunting book written while a prisoner in England by his chaplain, Gace de la Bugne," *Fortnightly Review*, LXXXI, (London, 1904), 789.

¹³ Nichols, I, 256, and William Kelly, *Royal progresses and visits to Leicester* (Leicester, 1884), *passim*, especially pp 146-9 for the reign of Edward III, also Knighton, II, 204, 233, 240 for Richard's visits in 1384 on the way to Scotland, in 1386 on the way to York, and in 1387. His letters patent are dated there in 1385 in July, August, and September.

¹⁴ *Records of the borough of Leicester, 1103-1603*, ed. Mary Bateson (Cambridge, 1901), II, 27.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 7, 10, 16, 52, for Edward's visits in 1327, in 1332 at Michaelmas, in 1334 at Quinquagesima, in 1342 at Candlemas.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 65, and 108-9.

purchases of wine and bread when Henry hunted in the Frith at Assumption (August 15) in 1343-4, and of beer "consumed at the wood" by the mayor and others "when the lord hunted in the forest" in 1350-51.¹⁷ John of Gaunt was customarily at Leicester Castle in August,¹⁸ and held a great hunting-party there in August, 1390.¹⁹

Leicester abbey, already wealthy,²⁰ prospered greatly by the generosity of the King and the duke. For all the ruinous expense of frequent royal visits, the abbot had plenty of money, his extensive building shows. He built the abbot's hall and the abbey gates,²¹ and between the hall and the inner gate was the King's Lodging, a tower with a turret, a tile roof, stone chimneys, glazed windows, several suites of rooms, and a gallery leading to the great dining chamber at the upper end of the abbot's hall. The hall was in the inner court.²² In the outer or entrance court were the stables. Here the hunt would assemble. Outside the entrance were more stables, and beyond lay the abbey deer park, the Frith, and Leicester Forest. Any of the King's retinue, staying the night at the abbey, might wake just as Chaucer wakes in the *Book of the Duchess*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 60, and 76

¹⁸ He was there in August, 1373, 1374, and 1375, *John of Gaunt's Register*, ed. Sydney Armitage-Smith (Royal Historical Society, Camden third series, London, 1911), *passim*

¹⁹ Knighton, II, 313

²⁰ The abbey's yearly income was about £1180, Thompson, "Monasteries of Leicestershire in the fifteenth century," p. 99, its net income, £780, *Visitations of the diocese of Lincoln, 1426-49*, ed. A. H. Thompson (Canterbury and York Society, XXIV, London, 1915-27), II, 213

²¹ Nichols, I, 262, and Appendix, p. 71

²² Joseph Burt, "Survey of the abbey of St. Mary de Pratishigh Leicester, temp. Henry VIII," *Archaeological Journal*, XXVII (London, 1870), 204 ff. "And at the entree out of the bascourt to the same standyth a tower the forefrunte all bryke with a turret well proporecyoned callyd the Kynges lodgyng, wherein ys two fayr chaumberes with wyndowes glasyd with chymneys and two inner chaumberes with chymneys, and belawe a parler with two inner chaumberes of lyke proporecyon and a gallere leydyng from the seyde tower belawe to iiij chaumberes with chymneys and to the hall, all of stone and coveryd with tyell, and to serten chaumberes above and belawe for officers, and a hyghe galere above leydyng from the foresayd tower at the gate to iiij chaumberes above with chymneys, and to the gret dynyng chaumber standyth on hyghe at the upper end of the Hall . . ."

I was waked
With smale foules a gret hepe

they sate
Upon my chambie 10of withoute
Upon the tyles over al aboute
And songen

My wyndowes weren shet echon
And through the glas the sunne shon
Upon my bed with brighte bemes

And as I lay thus, wonder lowde
Me thoghte I herde an hunte blowe
Tassaye his horn, and for to knowe
Whether hit were clere, or hois of sounne
And I herde goyng, bothe up and doune,
Men, hors, houndes, and othei thyng,
And al men speken of huntynge²³

The abbot was, then, like the Monk,
a fair for the maistrye,

A manly man to been an abbot able,²⁴

for by his hunting the abbey enjoyed a prosperity that would have been impossible otherwise, and he was more "able" than if he had observed scrupulously what "Austyn bit" as to hunting and hunting dogs, for he would have been less pleasing to the King and the duke, and his abbey would have prospered the less for it. The hand of the "governour wily and wys" is easily suspected in the statute passed by the Chapter of the Augustinian order which met at Leicester abbey in 1346,—that hunting dogs were not to be kept, but if they were kept at least they were not to be allowed in the refectory to eat the broken victuals that should go to the poor.²⁵

²³ Lines 295-6, 298-301, 335-7, 344-50

²⁴ *Canterbury Tales*, lines 165 and 167

²⁵ H E Salter, *Chapters of the Augustinian canons* (Canterbury and York society, xxix, London, 1922), p. 56 "Quod canonici non habeant canes hora prandii coram se," a variant of the prohibition in the Constitutions of Pope Benedict XII for the order, *Ibid*, Appendix II, xxxiv "Porro a venacionibus et aucupacionibus canonici dicte religionis abstineant, nec eis interesse aut canes ad opus venandi nec aves venaticas per se vel per alios tenere presumant, nisi saltus, vivaria vel guarennas proprias

Any Augustinian prior or abbot was likely to be, like the Monk, "an outrider" and "kepere of the celle"

An outridere that lovede veneiye

Ful many a deyntee hors hadde he in stable
And whan he rood men myghte his brydel heere
Gynglen in a whistlynge wynd als cleere
And eek as loude, as dooth the chapel belle.
Ther as this lord was kepere of the celle ²⁶

As the monasteries acquired more and more lands, the Augustinians came to live on the manors in small convents, each with its keeper or prior. The abbot came to have his own household, and he travelled about visiting the convents or cells, accompanied by one monk if he had one cell to govern, by two if he had two or three cells ²⁷. In the *Shipman's Tale*, Daun John, the outrider, travels with his abbot after the Augustinian custom, for he says to the merchant,

Oure abbot wole out of this toun anon,
And in his compaignye moot I goon ²⁸

The abbot of Leicester had several cells to govern,—Westgate at Leicester, Stoughton in the parish of Thurnby, Medoplek in the Peak in Derbyshire, Cockerham in Lancashire, and Ingwardby in the parish of Hungarton ²⁹. Only Ingwardby, the abbey's best grange,

vel ius venandi in alienis haberent Quo casu hoc eis permittitur dum tamen infra monasterium seu domos quas inhabitant aut eorum clausuras canes venaticos non teneant, nec venacioni presenciam exhibeant personalem. Sic qui vero eorum venacioni aut aucupacioni, clamose vel alias, cum canibus vel avibus ex proposito interfuerint, si quidem abbas fuerit vel prior seu prepositus aut alius administrator quicumque non habens superiorem eiusdem religionis per annum se noverit a beneficiorum collacione suspensum."

²⁶ Lines 166 and 168-72

²⁷ J. W. Clark, *Observances in use at the Augustinian priory of Barnwell* (Cambridge, 1897), pp. xxxv-vi, and 47. Nichols, I, 280, on the authority of William Charite, says that at each of the principal abbey granges, a monk had the title of master or prior, and the *custos* of Cockerham in 1360, John Derby, is noted from the *Coram Rege* Roll in the *Victoria County History*, Lancashire, II, 153.

²⁸ Lines 1551-2

²⁹ Nichols, IV, 565-6, on Westgate or Westcotes, II, 851 on Stoughton, III, 291-3 on Ingwardby, I, 281 on Medoplek, on Cockerham, Kirby Mallory, and Ingwardby or Ingarsby, note 11 above

had a chapel like the Monk's cell.³⁰ This grange had belonged to the Aungevilles, and it came to the abbey as part of the endowment of the chantry of Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury, in 1352. In 1439 the abbot was residing at Ingwardby and going to the abbey for chapter meetings. Two monks complained to the bishop that he had charged the brethren in general in chapter with theft of money belonging to him, and afterwards had practised magic at Ingwardby to discover the guilty monk. Then he came again into chapter and accused one of the two who complained to the bishop.³¹ As for horses, some of the patron's horses were stabled at the abbey, for the borough records mention "the keeper of the earl's horses at the abbey."³² A generation before Cloune's time the earl was spending about £485 a year to maintain 1500 "great horses" at Leicester,³³ the famous Leicester breed, the largest in England, it is said,³⁴ and the war-horses of the age of armored knights.

The Monk, like the abbot,³⁵ makes apology for his hunting. He begins with a remark about the Benedictine rule which has been taken to be evidence that he is a Benedictine,³⁶

The reule of seint Maure or of seint Beneit,
Bycause that it was old and somdel streit,—
This ilke Monk leet olde thynges pace
And heeld after the newe world the space.³⁷

³⁰ The abbey built a chapel at Stoughton in the village, not at the grange, William Burton, *Description of Leicestershire* (Lynn, 1777), p. 257. The chapel at Cockerham was burnt with the rest of the buildings in 1335, Knighton, I, 476. The abbey acquired Ingwardby chapel with the grange. The place is still known locally as "the Chapel," though the chapel had disappeared in Nichols' time. There is a description of Ingarsby Old Priory, with drawings of Tudor buildings still standing, in "Excursion to Houghton-on-Hill, Ingarsby, and Quenby," by S. T. Winckley, *Transactions of the Leicestershire archaeological society*, x (Leicester, 1909-10), 254-6.

³¹ *Visitations of the diocese of Lincoln*, II, 211-2.

³² Bateson, II, 16, in the *Visitations*, II, 209, the abbey revenues are mentioned as "the issues of mares and wool."

³³ Nichols, I, 223, from John Strype's edition of Stow's *Survey*.

³⁴ Nichols, II, part I, 4. The prior of Wymondley had, like the Monk, a "red" palfrey which was valued at 60s., *Calendar of the patent rolls of Edward III*, XII, 182.

³⁵ See above note 6, for the abbot's apology.

³⁶ Oliver F. Emerson, "Some of Chaucer's lines on the Monk," *Modern Philology*, I (Chicago, 1903), 105-15.

³⁷ Lines 173-6.

The Benedictine rule was already centuries "old" when the Augustinian order originated in the late eleventh century with the organization of the clergy of collegiate churches under a rule derived from the writings of Augustine of Hippo, and it was "sommel streit" to the Augustinian, not only to the monk who lived on the monastery lands like a lord of the manor, but even to the monk who lived by the rule.³⁸ The Augustinian, both priest and monk, was spared the long hours of choral duty, the labor, the simplicity of dress and diet, and the discipline of the Benedictine, and he was ridiculed by the Benedictine as pleasure-loving and self-indulgent, and given to feasting, drinking, and minstrelsy.³⁹ The Augustinian rule explains that St Augustine had "tempered the severity of this rule so as to include even those who were in bodily sickness."⁴⁰ The rule forbade living out of cloister, but permitted separate quarters to the sick, the aged, and officers of the monastery according to the demands of their duties.⁴¹ Any monk who chose to be an Augustinian rather than a Benedictine "leet olde thynges pace" to a certain degree, while Cloune "for the space" of the reign of a king "that loved venerye," "leet olde thynges pace" which were still kept by more conventional and less prosperous Augustinians. Leicester abbey "heeld after the newe world" in doctrine too, it was notoriously Lollard.⁴² Wyclif taught that life in the world is better than life in the cloister.⁴³ Chaucer reports the Monk's own version of this doctrine in the lines,

He yaf nat of that text a pulled hen
That seith that hunters beth nat hooly men,
Ne that a Monk whan he is reccheles
Is likned til a fissh that is waterlees,
This is to seyn, a Monk out of his cloystre
But thilke text heeld he nat worth an oystre,
And I seyde his opinoun was good.⁴⁴

Everybody, rich and poor, humble and powerful, his patrons and

³⁸ Clark, p. 33 "Many choose a strict rule, scanty food, coarse dress, others a less severe rule, more delicate food, and softer dress"

³⁹ Nigel Wireker, *Speculum stultorum*, ed Thomas Wright, *Anglo-Latin satirical poets of the twelfth century* (London, 1872), pp. 89-90.

⁴⁰ Clark, p. 35

⁴¹ Salter, Appendix II, no. XXIX.

⁴² Trevelyan, *Age of Wyclif*, pp. 313-21

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 159

⁴⁴ Lines 177-83

his convent, "seyde" the abbot's "opmoun was good."⁴⁵ He presented the abbey with two copies of the *Decretales* in which the Monk's texts on hunting and living out of cloister occur,⁴⁶ and with two volumes of commentary and the Pauline epistles glossed by himself⁴⁷ The abbot would, according to custom, have a collection of books for his own use at the hall at the abbey and at Ingwardby, his country residence Through Cloune, there were Oxford scholars to study in the abbey cloister⁴⁸ There were scribes too to write in the scriptorium,⁴⁹ and scores of lay servants in the monastery and the barnyard⁵⁰ But no one could fill the abbot's place "serving the world" as "the most famous and notable hunter of hares among all the lords of the realm" If he had devoted himself to study and labor, how indeed would the "new world" have been served, not only the fashionable world, the King, the Prince, the duke of Lancaster, and the other nobles who required this new kind of service of the abbot in return for their patronage, but also the Leicester monks⁵¹ themselves who reaped the benefits of their

⁴⁵ Knighton, II, 126 "Hic bonorum operum sectator incessabilis, subditis et minoribus mitis et affabilis, majoribus et magnatibus regni medicabiliter amabilis"

⁴⁶ W W Skeat, *Complete works of Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894-97), v, 20

⁴⁷ MS Laud 623 (Bodleian Library, Oxford), folio 8v, line 18, folio 42r, line 2, folio 41v, line 27, folio 43r, line 3, from a photostat copy which I have by courtesy of the Bodleian Library, one of a collection of photostats purchased out of the stipend of the Alice Freeman Palmer Memorial Fellowship, the American Association of University Women, 1933-4, to be placed in an American library as the gift of the Fellowship The Thorney abbey list of borrowers in MS Tanner 10 (Bodleian Library) shows a copy of the *Decreta* kept out by the "lord abbot" year after year Some names of borrowers have been erased in MS Laud 623, and Thomas Hearne cites MS Laud 625 as his source for an "Indentura precentoris de omnibus libris traditis per ipsum quibuscumque fratribus" of Charite's time, Nichols, I, part 2, 70, but no longer in the Laud MS and not known in the Bodleian Library My acknowledgments are due to J R Liddell of the Bodleian Library who examined MS Laud 625 for this record

⁴⁸ See above note 11

⁴⁹ Nichols, I, 276, notes three scribes mentioned in an early deed

⁵⁰ *Visitations*, II, 210, in 1439 there were fifty-two servants in the monastery and eighteen in the barnyard Manual labor was held to be unworthy of the Augustinians of Chetwode in 1446, Salter, p 114 For the Augustinian rule as to labor, Clark, pp 21-2

⁵¹ Knighton, II, 127; also note 11 above The abbey had for each monk a church, a chapel, and two mills, Nichols, I, 279 There were about twenty-

abbot's hunting in manors, granges, and fairs, mills and woods, churches and chapels, rents and tenements, in an endowment for their education at the university, in appointments as abbots and priors to neighboring monasteries, in the vigorous intellectual freedom which the Wyclifite tendencies of the abbey attest, and in the peace, security, and independence which the house enjoyed in the shelter of the favor and power of the King and the dukes of Lancaster, as with the Monk,

Lat Austyn have his swynk to him reserved
 Therefore he was a prikasour aright,
 Grehoundes he hadde as swift as fowel in flight,
 Of prikyng and of huntyng for the hare
 Was al his lust, for no cost wolde he spare⁵²

"No cost wolde he spare" in order to have the benefits of the patronage of the great. The chronicler says he spared no cost in the interests of peace among all men,⁵³ whatever this may mean, and it could not be said that he spared any cost in his hunting, even though the King's Lodging may not have been provided with windows "y-wrought" with "al the storie of Troye" and walls painted with "al the Romaunce of the Rose."⁵⁴ Even in the abbot's pension and all the rich grants which the abbey had of his generous patrons, there may not have been full recompense for his lavish expenditure in hospitality, for the abbey's wealth steadily declined from about 1335.⁵⁵

To summarize the Monk's apology for his hunting, he explains first how it is that he prefers to be an Augustinian rather than a Benedictine, and then goes on to show that he is not the old-fashioned kind of Augustinian to whom Cloune made excuses for his hunting, but a liberal, ready to "leet pace" "the olde thynges"

five monks, MS Laud 623, folios 47r-48r, Nichols, I, 274, also *Visitations*, II, 207 ff, about fifteen mentioned in 1439

⁵² Lines 188-92

⁵³ Knighton, II, 126 "Hic pacis et tranquillitatis amator erat, hic discordiarum et injuriarum in patria sua et ubique reformator fuit, quas suis temporibus ubique motus pro suo posse, pro labore vel expensis non omit-tens, reformare et pacificare totis viribus elaborare studuit, sanguinis semper abhorrens et pertimescens effusionem"

⁵⁴ *Book of the Duchess*, lines 321-4

⁵⁵ Nichols, I, 279, the abbey pleads extraordinary expenses for hospitality in a petition to the pope, see above, note 9.

that "Austyn bit,"—study and labor and living in cloister,—in order to render the new kind of service which the "new world" required of this hunter of hares,—that he hunt. The phrases, "how shal the world be served?" and "no cost wolde he spare," fit very aptly the abbot's peculiar economic relation to the patrons who hunted with him. Nothing is known of the abbot that suggests an explanation of the Monk's reference to St Maure, he speaks as if he had made a choice, like Alexander Necham, between the Benedictine and Augustinian orders, and had considered a French Benedictine house. No records of the abbot are known before his election in 1345. A William de Cloune was a wealthy burgess of Leicester, admitted to the Gild of Merchants by special order of the earl in 1318, in Parliament in 1332, steward in 1333-4, mayor in 1338-9, and bailiff from 1338 to 1343 when he disappears from the records two years before the abbot's election.⁵⁶

Chaucer's lines on the Monk's person, though they ridicule, suggest that his appearance was striking and prepossessing,⁵⁷ as does the chronicler's remark that the abbot's "face and his presence were inexpressibly gracious to everyone,"⁵⁸ though of course compliments of this kind were a convention. As for the Monk's dress,⁵⁹ fur was forbidden all Augustinians except dignitaries of the church, and lambskin was prescribed for the lining of cassock and hood, but the brasses of the fifteenth century show that Augustinians of that time wore cassocks lined with fur and hoods made entirely of grys with the tails hanging around the hem as a fringe. The Augustinian hood was put on like a shawl and usually not joined in front though it was sometimes fastened, like the Monk's, with a morse,⁶⁰

And for to festne his hood under his chyn
He hadde of gold y-wroght a ful curious pyn,
A love-knotte in the gretter end ther was.⁶¹

The love-knot in medieval symbolism signifies the *summum bonum*.

⁵⁶ Bateson, I, 309, and II, 13, 17, 18, 39, 450, 460

⁵⁷ Lines 198-202

⁵⁸ Knighton, II, 126 "vultus ejus et presentia divitibus et pauperibus omnibus inenarrabiliter desiderabilis"

⁵⁹ Lines 193-4

⁶⁰ Clark, pp lxxv-xxx, and sources, and for the prohibition on furs in the Constitutions of Pope Benedict XII, Salter, p 247, no xxx

⁶¹ Lines 195-7

It is expounded at length in Thomas Usk's *Testament of Love* in an elaborate allegory associating the knot with a pearl and a tree. The subject of Usk's first book is the pearl, of his second the knot, and of his third the tree.⁶² Usk says that "the blis of paradyse to mennes sory hertes in this tre abydeþ," the knot "closeth hertes so togider that rancour is outthresten," and "the knotte in the herte," or "parfit blisse," is to be achieved not by riches, dignity, power, or renown, but by virtue of the pearl which is "grace, lerning, or els wisdom of God, or els holy church."⁶³ A similar symbol is painted on one of the remnants of the medieval windows in the old town hall at Leicester (c 1500),—a knot formed by a tasseled cord drawn through and looped within a braided wreath above the knot, and intricately tied around standing tree fragments below it, the whole is surrounded by a circle with the chalice emblem of the Corpus Christi guild of Leicester repeated five times above the circle and four below.⁶⁴ The original design of the windows may have symbolized the relation of the hall to the guild.⁶⁵ The knot symbol is here used by a guild, and Usk was much involved in guild affairs, the knot, then, may possibly have been in common use as a symbol of fraternity. If so, the Monk's pin may imply an interest in some religious fraternity such as the Corpus Christi guild at Leicester. As for the Monk's boots, shoes were prescribed by the Augustinian rule, but the Leicester monks wore boots by a papal dispensation of Cloune's time.⁶⁶ The Monk's favorite roast, a swan, was very expensive at Leicester, a heron cost 3s, a pheasant 1s. 6d, a goose 3d, a chicken 2½d, and a capon or partridge, 2d., but a swan for the earl's Christmas dinner cost 6s, and for the judges' dinner 7s.⁶⁷ Perhaps Chaucer implies that the Monk was fond of high festivities of this kind, and was usually invited. The abbey might fatten

⁶² W. W. Skeat, *Chaucerian and other pieces* (Oxford, 1897), I, summarized in note 3, p. 24, of my article, "The date of Thomas Usk's *Testament of Love*," *Modern Philology*, XXVI (Chicago, 1928).

⁶³ *Chaucerian and other pieces*, p. 56, lines 94-5, p. 80, lines 85-6, p. 145, lines 102-3.

⁶⁴ Nichols, I, 353-4, plate 31, no. 14.

⁶⁵ A. B. McDonald, "The stained glass in the mayor's parlor," *Transactions of the Leicestershire archaeological society*, XIII (Leicester, 1923-4), 69.

⁶⁶ Nichols, I, 262, but see Salter, pp. xxvii-viii on boots.

⁶⁷ Bateson, II, *passim*, cf. the index on Prices, and pp. 15, 27, 45.

its own swans, for it had water mills and at least one moated manor house, at Kirkby Mallory.⁶⁸

There were greyhounds at Leicester abbey, "a great crowd of useless hounds" consuming the alms, as late as 1439, but the abbot of that time was lavishing the abbey's wealth on alchemy to the "grievous damage" of the house,⁶⁹ and it is certain that after Cloune's time whatever royal favor the abbots enjoyed was not due to the King's pleasure in their talents with hounds and hares, though Cloune was quite likely to make skilful hunters of some of the younger monks, and the King and the duke in hunting with the abbot might start a fashion among the gentry who had monasteries in their patronage. When Cloune died about six months after King Edward and almost a year after Wyclif's trial, the "new world" of his time was already giving place to a still newer world. The liberalism of Edward's reign was passing. Leicester abbey, always a favorite with the king, followed the trend of the times and in Richard's reign turned away from Lollardry and reverted to "the olde thynges" which had been "leet pace." Philip de Repindon, the most distinguished Leicester monk of this "new world," had been associated with Wyclif at Oxford, but recanted and afterwards became abbot and then bishop of Lincoln. Like Repindon, the intellectual, conventional, irreproachable Monk of the prologue and epilogue to the *Monk's Tale* is of this new era, while the Monk of the *Prologue* is of the older era, though both are hunters. Is Cloune the person who has been sought in the records as the living model portrayed—presumably—in the Monk?⁷⁰ The available evidence is inadequate to prove that he is or that he is not, as in all identifications of the Pilgrims that have been proposed except that of Harry Bailly, keeper of the Tabard Inn, with the Host. There is much in the chronicler's account of the abbot that cannot be explained for lack of records, and the abbot's history fails to explain every detail in the lines on the Monk in the *Prologue*. Then too no attempt has been made here to exhaust the records of Cloune and his abbey, and of other hunting monks and their monasteries. Further, if Chaucer composed the sketch in the *Prologue* after King

⁶⁸ Nichols, iv, 764, note, and ii, 851, on the mill at Stoughton

⁶⁹ *Visitations*, ii, 208

⁷⁰ John M. Manly, *Some new light on Chaucer* (New York, 1926), pp 261-2, 221-2

Edward's death and as a satire on Cloune, the best time for its reception at court was passed, if he composed it before Edward's death, then he was—contrary to the general belief that he did not begin the *Canterbury Tales* before 1387—at work on the *Prologue* at least a decade earlier than has been supposed, or he used old material in the *Prologue* as well as in the *Tales*, and the life of Cloune in the chronicle was written after Chaucer's sketch. In short, in order to know whether Cloune is or is not the Monk, it would be necessary to know much more about hunting monks and about Chaucer and the *Canterbury Tales* than is possible now. The date 1387 is of course hypothetical, not proved, and any consideration of it is beyond the scope of this paper. Here it should be noticed—but without any but tentative inferences—that the chronicler's statement that the abbot was the foremost hunter of hares in the realm "so that" he hunted with the King, implies that he was the only "hunter of hares" who was honored with the King's patronage. If he were, then at court and in the household of Lancaster, for those who had hunted with the abbot, Chaucer's Monk would inevitably recall Cloune's hounds, his "prikyng" for the hare, his protestations of his virtue, and the flourishing prosperity of his house, the reward of his peculiar sort of virtue; in the phrases, "how shal the world be served?" and "no cost wolde he spare," there would be definite allusion to the abbot's economic relation to his patrons, the Monk's cell would signify the opulence of Ingwardby, the richest of the gifts in which the abbot was indulged; and in the Monk's "deyntee" horses there would be a reminder of the ludicrous rôle of the abbot among the great and fashionable,—perhaps too of the glory of the house of Lancaster in the history of English chivalry. The King was hunting at Leicester before Chaucer began to see the world as page to the countess of Ulster in 1357-8, and by 1370, the time of the *Book of the Duchess*, the King and his train had many a time hunted in Leicester Forest and then left for the North as the Emperor and the hunt ride away toward Richmond at the end of the poem, and of course no English forest is so suitable as Leicester for the scene of the elegy for the heiress of Lancaster.

RAMONA BRESSIE

Chicago, Ill

THE CHRONOLOGY OF *THE RETURN OF THE NATIVE*

In a recent article it was stated that in writing *The Return of the Native* Hardy "had before him the calendar for the year 1842" and that throughout the story "he paid careful attention to dates"¹ His accuracy, it is further stated, "is certainly to be traced to the early studies of the young architect"² That Hardy actually had a calendar for the year 1842 before him is open to a reasonable doubt. The purpose of this note, however, is to indicate the many instances where he apparently quite lost sight of that calendar if he had one.

Book I opens on a "Saturday afternoon in November," which, we learn in chapter 3, is the fifth of the month³ The action of the first eight chapters takes place on that day The next evening (chap 9) Diggory Venn watches unsuccessfully for a meeting between Eustacia and Wildeve at Rainbarrow. "The same hour the next evening found him again at the same place" We are told that Venn "pursued precisely the same course yet four nights longer, and without success." On the next night, "the day-week of their previous meeting" (i e., November 12), Eustacia and Wildeve come together, and Venn overhears Wildeve propose that she elope with him to America.

"The next morning," which was Sunday (chap. 10), the reddleman calls upon Eustacia to try to persuade her to give up Wildeve, he is unsuccessful He then meets Mrs. Yeobright on her way to the Quiet Woman (chap 11) and offers himself as a possible husband for Thomasin Using this proposal as a weapon to force Wildeve to a decision, Mrs. Yeobright extracts from him a promise to let her know within a day or two what his intentions are. His exact words are: "I will write to you or call in a day or two" (p. 119).

Mrs Yeobright's "visit sent Wildeve the same evening after dark to Eustacia's house at Mistover," where he presses her for an answer to his proposal of the day preceding. She pleads for time, but

¹ Carl J Weber, "Chronology in Hardy's Novels," *PMLA*, LIII (March, 1938), 314

² P 320

³ Thomas Hardy, *The Return of the Native* (New York Harper and Brothers, 1895) All subsequent citations of book and chapter will be made from this edition Page citations will be made only when they are considered necessary.

promises to give her answer on "Monday week," the day being set by Wildeve (p 123), and he repeats, when she gives Rainbarrow as the place, "On Monday week at this time I will be at the Barrow" "Monday week" would be, of course, November 21. After the interview with Wildeve, Eustacia goes indoors and is told by her grandfather that Clym Yeobright "is coming home next week to spend Christmas with his mother"

When Book II opens, considerable time has elapsed, "the winter solstice having stealthily come on" (chap 1). It is, therefore, about December 21 or 22. Eustacia learns by overhearing a conversation between Sam and Humphrey that Clym is "coming across the water to Budmouth by steamer." Evidently Captain Vye's information to Eustacia, on Sunday, November 13, that Clym would be "coming home next week" is false. Is this a slip by Hardy, or did Captain Vye, "grog in hand" at the Quiet Woman, become befuddled?⁴ At any rate, that same December afternoon, after overhearing the conversation, Eustacia walks "in the direction of Blooms-End."

Meanwhile, in chapter 2, Mrs. Yeobright and Thomasin are making preparations for Clym's arrival. During their talk Thomasin says that now she must marry Wildeve for "pride's sake." Mrs. Yeobright's advice is

"Well, wait till he repeats his offer. I think he may do it, now that he knows—something I told him"

"What did you tell him?"

"That he was standing in the way of another lover of yours" (p 136)

All this is as if Mrs. Yeobright had seen Wildeve only recently. As a matter of fact, they last met on November 13, it will be recalled, and Wildeve had promised to give his answer in a day or two. As Eustacia is returning toward Mistover she catches a glimpse of Clym on his way home (chap 3). She dreams of him that night, and awakes the next morning to reflect upon the significance of her vision.

At this point the time indications become rather vague. It is stated that "she took an airing twice or thrice a day upon the Egdon hills." If the five occasions of Eustacia's sallying forth represent the passage of two days, we may date Clym's homecoming December 21, for "the evening of this last day of expectation . . . was the twenty-third of December" (chap 4).

⁴ Bk. I, chap 11, p. 124

This was the evening when the mummers practised at Captain Vye's. To Fairway's question whether they had got all their clothes ready they answer, "We shall by Monday" We learn thereupon that Monday is their "first outing," which is to be at the home of Mrs. Yeobright, who is giving a party, "because 'tis the first Christmas that her son Clym has been home for a long time" On "the next evening," which would be December 24, Charley brings his costume to Eustacia so that she may take his part in the play. "The next evening" (chap 5) would be Christmas, December 25. It is the night of the play and the party at Mrs. Yeobright's, and, as we have learned, it is a Monday Be it noted, however, that if November 5 is a Saturday, then Christmas should fall on a Sunday.

A more important error follows in chapter 6 As Eustacia is returning from the party at Blooms-End, she is suddenly reminded by the form of Rainbarrow standing above the hills "of a circumstance which till that moment she had totally forgotten She had promised to meet Wildeve by the Barrow this very night at eight, to give a final answer to his pleading for an elopement" (p. 178). But as we have seen, the meeting had been arranged for Monday, November 21, and not for Monday, December 25 There is, moreover, an additional error "She herself had fixed the evening and the hour" Strictly, Wildeve had fixed both, and Eustacia had suggested Rainbarrow as the place

When Eustacia, "the next morning" (chap. 7), encounters Venn on the heath, Hardy writes "Wildeve had told her at their last meeting that Venn had been thrust forward by Mrs. Yeobright as one ready and anxious to take his place as Thomasin's betrothed" (pp. 181-2) As a matter of fact, Wildeve had done nothing of the sort, and Mrs Yeobright, for obvious reasons, was careful to withhold the name of Thomasin's suitor. Indeed, Wildeve had asked Mrs Yeobright to name the new suitor, but she had declined to do so.⁵ When Wildeve met Eustacia that evening (November 13) he had only this to say concerning Thomasin's unknown admirer "She (Mrs. Yeobright) only says she wishes me to give up Thomasin because another man is anxious to marry her"⁶ But by the night of December 26 Wildeve has somehow discovered whom Mrs. Yeobright meant, for he tells Venn "Mrs. Yeobright says you are to marry her" (p. 188)

⁵ I, 11, 118

⁶ P 121

Have Mrs. Yeobright and Wildeve, Wildeve and Eustacia, met since that Sunday of November 13? If they have, Hardy has scarcely played cricket with his readers. Indeed, any supposition that these meetings might have taken place during the "lost" days between November 13 and December 21 is extremely weak, for the structure of the novel indicates that Hardy had intended to be careful of such details.

"On that evening (i e., December 26) the interior of Blooms-End . . . had been rather silent" (chap 8). Clym "had gone on a few days' visit to a friend about ten miles off." Inasmuch as the Christmas party had taken place the night before, he had probably left home only that morning. Nevertheless, Mrs. Yeobright has not only received a letter from him, but has read it "for the tenth time that day", Clym has not only heard of Thomasin's predicament, but has had time to "contradict the tale everywhere"—all this in the space of a day. On this same evening, after Wildeve's dash to claim Thomasin, she tells Mrs. Yeobright that "he would like the wedding to be day after to-morrow." "The next day (i e., December 27) was passed in mere mechanical deeds of preparation" for the wedding. "The appointed morning (i e., December 28) came." Thomasin goes off to be married to Wildeve, and Clym returns from his "few days' visit" that lasted from the twenty-sixth to the morning of the twenty-eighth.

The next inconsistency does not occur until the summer has arrived. On June 25 Clym and Eustacia are married.⁷ We are told, in chapter 1 of book IV, that "about six weeks after their union" (i e., about August 6), Mrs. Yeobright visits Eustacia to inquire after the missing guineas. "Next day (chap 2) the mystery of the guineas was explained." After this Clym "read far into the small hours during many nights." The result was an affliction of the eyes, and it was not until "the third week had arrived, when he went into the open air for the first time since the attack."

One would suspect that at least it is now very near the end of August. "The very next day" Clym procures the necessary equipment with which to cut furze. "Day after day he rose with the sun" to labor on the heath. Surely, now it must be September, but Hardy evidently hasn't bothered to count the days. "A few days later, before the month of August had expired" (chap. 3)

⁷ Cf. Bk. III, chap. 6, pp. 258, 260 and chap. 7, p. 267.

Eustacia attends the village festival at East Egdon. Her return in the company of Wildeve is observed by Diggory Venn, and "on the night after the festival" (chap 4) Venn trails Wildeve to Alderworth "A night or two later" Wildeve again goes to Alderworth; again he is trailed by Venn. That same night the latter calls upon Mrs Yeobright to persuade her to visit Clym and bring about a reconciliation, this she promises to do, and she goes (chap. 5) on August 31, which is a Thursday, as Hardy correctly mentions. Thus, according to the most conservative estimate, Hardy has packed in more days between June 25 and August 31 than actually exist.

Although from this point Hardy is reasonably accurate in his chronology, a few minor errors might be pointed out. On the night of "Thursday, the thirty-first of August" Mrs. Yeobright dies (chap 8), after her unsuccessful attempt to see her son. The funeral could hardly have been held before the next day. We are told in chapter 1 of book V that "one evening, about three weeks after the funeral of Mrs. Yeobright," Clym, who apparently has been ill for a considerable length of time, is visited by Thomasin. During the course of their conversation she intimates that her child will arrive "in another month or two." The day of her visit must have been about September 21.

Meanwhile, "Clym's grief" (chap 2) became mitigated by wearing itself out. His strength returned, and a month after the visit of Thomasin (i e., about October 21) he might have been seen "walking about the garden." "One evening" news is brought to him of the birth of Thomasin's child. If Hardy's chronology is here to be trusted, then on the fatal night of November 6 the baby is about two weeks old. But on that night Thomasin tells Venn that her baby is "nearly two months old" (chap. 8). If the baby is that old, it was born shortly after September 6, about two weeks before Thomasin tells Clym that she is expecting the baby "in another month or two." Fond parents, even on rainy nights such as November 6 was, do not make such large errors in the age of a baby.

However, to return to chapter 2 of book V, "the morrow came," and "the next day" (i e., about October 23) Clym encounters Venn, who has been absent from the heath ever since August 31. "I called here (i. e., Blooms-End, to see Mrs. Yeobright) the day

before I left," says Venn. Evidently he has lost track of the days, for upon hearing of Mrs. Yeobright's death, he remarks "When I parted from her a month ago everything seemed to say that she was going to begin a new life." But even Hardy is momentarily forgetful of the time that has elapsed since the death of Mrs. Yeobright. A few pages later, when Clym is considering whether he should interview Johnny Nunsuch in an attempt to get further particulars concerning his meeting with Mrs. Yeobright on the day she died, Hardy writes "To probe a child's mind after the lapse of six weeks . . . did not promise much." In reality, almost eight weeks had elapsed. It might be argued, however, that this was Clym's mistake and not Hardy's.

Finally, two inconsistencies in the events that occur on the fatal November 6 should be alluded to. At half-past eleven that night, when Captain Vye puts out his own light (Chap. 7), Eustacia lights the candle in her room (p. 440), preparatory to going out to meet Wildeve. Since Mistover Knap is about one and one-half miles from the Rainbarrow,⁸ it must be nearing twelve when she arrives there. Chapter eight opens with Yeobright sitting "lonely at Blooms-End," while Eustacia "was standing on Rainbarrow." But we learn within a few sentences that "between ten and eleven o'clock . . . he retired to rest, and . . . soon fell asleep." Thomasin awakens him from this sleep "about an hour after" and engages him in talk for perhaps ten minutes when Captain Vye enters (pp. 447-9) and explains that Eustacia had left his house "about half an hour ago." It is thus midnight, about the time, or only a few minutes after, that Eustacia arrived at the Barrow. Obviously, then, Clym cannot be sitting "lonely at Blooms-End," while Eustacia "was standing on Rainbarrow." And upon hearing the news from Captain Vye, Clym immediately departs from the house.

The other inconsistency occurs between the time it takes Thomasin to walk from the Quiet Woman to Blooms-End and the time it takes to return. Between half-past ten and eleven o'clock she begins her journey to Blooms-End.⁹ As we have seen, she arrives there at about ten minutes to twelve, so that her walk takes about an hour or possibly more. She remains in the house after Clym and Captain Vye (it is about midnight) have gone out and leaves approximately

⁸ I, 3, 33.

⁹ Cf. pp. 448-9, 458.

five or ten minutes later (cf pp 451-2) About "a quarter past midnight" (chap. 9) Eustacia falls into the stream. While the "hasty actions" (p. 462) of Wildeve and Clym to save Eustacia are in progress, Venn and Thomasin are near enough to see "the removal of the carriage-lamp" and to watch "its motion into the mead" Thomasin's return, therefore, takes about fifteen minutes, about one quarter the time of her expedition to Blooms-End.

Besides the inconsistencies in chronology, this analysis has also pointed out inconsistencies of another kind—incongruities of fact. These errors are scarcely important enough to be regarded as serious blunders—the casual reader would not observe them—but they suggest the possibility that a thorough study of all the Wessex novels would yield results indicating that perhaps too much has been made of Hardy's "blue-print habits."

ALBERT A MURPHREE
CARL F. STRAUCH

The Johns Hopkins University
Lehigh University

HARDY'S DEBT TO WEBSTER IN *THE RETURN OF THE NATIVE*

John Webster's *The White Devil* is evidently one of "the finer plays of three hundred years ago" which commanded Thomas Hardy's admiration¹ He owned a set of Hazlitt's edition of Webster's plays (1857); and in volume two, containing *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi*, his annotations, though they consist simply of pencilled lines in the margin, two corrections in the text, and notes on the relationship of characters in the cast of the second play, indicate that he read with attention² In connection

¹ "Candour in English Fiction," *New Review*, Jan, 1890, reprinted in *Life and Art Essays*, collected by E Brennecke, Jr (New York, 1925), p 77

² For this information I am indebted to Lieut-Col Charles D Drew, curator and secretary of the Dorset County Museum, where, in the Hardy Memorial Collection, Hardy's set is now preserved. Hardy marked none of the passages referred to in this paper. Because Hazlitt's edition is the one he knew, I use it, unless otherwise stated, rather than that of F. L. Lucas (Oxford, 1937), and refer to passages by page and line (in Lucas,

with Hardy, Webster has been mentioned only in general discussions of tragedy and of Hardy's affinity with the great Elizabethans. Henry C Duffin in his study of Hardy says that aside from Shakespeare, only two writers have been able to achieve scenes of inevitable, terrible verisimilitude these scenes are to be found "in Webster occasionally, and in Hardy with some frequency."³ He names among other scenes the quarrel between Clym and Eustacia in *The Return of the Native* (Book V, Chap. 3), and finds that "in its agony, its mutual misunderstanding, its passionate grief and regret, its tremendous anger, it is profoundly reminiscent of some of the scenes between Othello and Desdemona, especially of that in Act IV, Scene 2."⁴ I wish to show that this scene was inspired directly by Webster. the quarrel between Brachiano and Vittoria (*W. D.* iv, 11) is also "one of the greatest of all scenes of combat between man and woman"⁵

The imitative passages, quoted in parallel for convenience, should be read in their context, since much has been omitted from each scene and the sequence of quotations from Webster disarranged

by act, scene and line) The texts of passages quoted differ widely in spelling, line arrangement, and scene-division, but little in sense. References to *The Return of the Native* (1878) are made to Harper's Anniversary Edition. I regret that I have been unable to consult the MS. the many published texts show careful progressive revision

³ *Thomas Hardy A Study of the Wessex Novels, the Poems, and "The Dynasts,"* 3rd ed (Manchester, 1937), p. 104

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 107 This judgment is supported by Carl J. Weber in "Thomas Hardy Twin Voice of Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* IX (Apr., 1934), 97. That Mr. Duffin is also reminded of the scene between Melantius and Evadne in Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Maid's Tragedy* is interesting because apparently both Webster and Hardy knew the play. Cf. (in Lucas's ed.) *W. D.*, iv, 11, 43-45 with *M. T.* (Cambridge ed., vol. 1) II, p. 22. In *Far From the Madding Crowd* (1874, Anniversary ed., p. 352), gloomy Bathsheba calls for Beaumont and Fletcher's play. But there is no more direct influence from it than from *Othello* in Hardy's scene.

⁵ *Ibid.* Possible influence of *The Duchess of Malfi* on the same novel may be noted. cf. the idea in Bk. V, Chap. 2, pp. 379-380 with iv, 11, 237, 21-24; the situation in Bk. I, Chap. 6, pp. 70-71 with i, 11, 175-177 (Lucas, i, 1, 406 ff.), the impression made upon the reader by Bk. IV, Chap. 6, pp. 339-341 with iv, 11, 236-238. I have found no trace of influence from either play on any other of Hardy's works except perhaps two poems in *Human Shows* (1925) reminiscent of situations in *D. M.* cf. the first three stanzas of "A Poor Man and a Lady" with i, 11, 173-178 (Lucas, i, 1, 406 ff.), and "The Echo Elf Answers" with v, 111.

'Clym,' she answered slowly, 'do you think you dare do anything to me that I dare not bear (387) ?'

[Eustacia] 'Poor charity (388) '

[Clym] * 'How often does he write to you? Where does he put his letters—when does he meet you? Ah, his letters!' . 'Come, come! stand away! I must see them (388-389) '

[Clym breaks open her desk and finds an empty envelope in Wildeve's handwriting]

'Can you read, madam? Look at this envelope Doubtless we shall find more soon, and what was inside them I shall no doubt be gratified by learning in good time what a well-finished and full-blown adept in a certain trade my lady is '

'Do you say it to me—do you?' she gasped (389)

'What was in this letter?' he said

'Ask the writer Am I your hound that you should talk to me in this way?'

'Do you brave me? do you stand me out, mistress? Answer (389) '

[Clym, of Mrs Yeobright] 'Call her to mind—think of her—what goodness there was in her it showed in every line of her face (390) ' '

[Eustacia] 'I have lost all through you, but I have not complained Your blunders and misfortunes may have been a sorrow to you, but they have been a wrong to me All persons of refinement have been scared

[Vit] What dar'st thou do, that I not dare to suffer, (87, 14) ?

Vit O poor charity (III, II, 57, 8) '

[Brach] Come, come, let's see your cabinet, discover Your treasury of love-letters. Death and furies! I'll see them all (84, 16-18)

Brach ' Can you read, mistress? look upon that letter There are no characters, nor hieroglyphics You need no comment, I am grown your receiver God's precious! you shall be a brave great lady, A stately and advanced whore Vit Say, sir (84, 10-15) ?

Flam am I your dog?

Brach A blood-hound do you brave, do you stand me (82, 25-26) ? *

Brach [of Isabella] O my sweetest duchess, How lovely art thou now (85, 18-19) '

Vit What have I gain'd by thee, but infamy? Thou hast stain'd the spotless honour of my house, And frighted thence noble society:

* Clym has no knowledge of letters from a lover of Eustacia, Brachiano holds in his hand a letter which Francisco had intended him to intercept

† This passage opens IV, II in Hazlitt, in Lucas, it is lines 73 ff

* Hazlitt, IV, 1; Lucas, IV, II, 51-53.

away from me since I sank into the mire of marriage Is this your cherishing—to put me into a hut like this, and keep me like the wife of a hind? You deceived me—not by words, but by appearances, which are less seen through than words But the place will serve as well as any other—as somewhere to pass from—into my grave' Her words were smothered in her throat, and her head drooped down

'I don't know what you mean by that Am I the cause of your sin?' (Eustacia made a trembling motion towards him) 'What, you can begin to shed tears and offer me your hand? Good God! can you? No, not I I'll not commit the fault of taking that' (The hand she had offered dropped nervelessly, but the tears continued flowing) 'Well, yes, I'll take it, if only for the sake of my own foolish kisses that were wasted there before I knew what I cherished How bewitched I was!'⁹ How could there be any good in a woman that everybody spoke ill of (391)?'

[Eustacia] 'Best natures commit bad faults sometimes, don't they (392)?'

What do you call this house?
Is this your palace? did not the judge style it
A house of penitent whores? who sent me to it?

go, go, brag
How many ladies you have undone like me

I do wish
That I could make you full executor
To all my sins O that I could toss myself
Into a grave as quickly! For all thou'rt worth
I'll not shed one tear more—I'll burst first (86, 3-5, 8-10, 13-14, 19-23)

Flam Pander! Am I the author of your sin (87, 5)?

Brach What! dost weep?
Procure but ten of thy dissembling trade,
Ye'd furnish all the Irish funerals
With howling past wild Irish
That hand, that cursed hand, which I have wearied
With doating kisses! .

I was bewitch'd,
For all the world speaks ill of thee (85, 12-15, 17-18, 20-21)

[*Flam*] Best natures do commit the grossest faults, (88, 21)

These parallels show that Hardy has rearranged and adapted several parts of Webster's scene, they do not show the most important fact, which an independent reading of each scene in its entirety will reveal: Hardy's expansion and complete transmutation of his material into a passage natural to his characters, appropriate

⁹ Cf "Don't look at me with those eyes as if you would bewitch me again (389)!" and "'You have held my happiness in the hollow of your hand, and like a devil you have dashed it down (386)!'"

to his needs, characteristic of his temper. The differences are as important as the similarities, and both Webster and Hardy profit by their literary relationship.

MARCIA LEE ANDERSON

Duke University

HILDEBRANDSLIED 20-22a.

Interpreters of HL 20-22a ¹

her funlaet in lante luttala sitten
 prut in buie barn unwahsan
 arbeo laosa

have busied themselves mainly with problems of manuscript readings, language, and metrics, and only to a limited extent with such legal questions as are suggested by this situation. A man follows his lord into exile. What happens to his wife, his issue, his property? ² The reason for this seems to be that some commentators have tried to explain the HL from the manuscript text, without the "outside help" of historical sources or of parallel sagas or of kindred motifs ³. Thus Elis Wadstein wrote, in 1903, at the end of

¹ See W. Braune, *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch*^s (Halle, 1921), pp. 180 ff. and p. 184 for lines 20-22a, *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch*ⁿ (Halle, 1928), pp. 186 ff. and pp. 189 f. for lines 20-22a.

² There are, to be sure, attempts at juridical interpretations of the whole of the HL. G. Ehrismann, e.g., claims for the second half of the dialogue the structure of Germanic legal procedure in *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters, Erster Teil* (München, 1932), p. 130 with note 1. And Paul Punschart, "Zur rechtsgeschichtlichen Auslegung des Hildebrandsliedes," *Festschrift zu Ehren Emil von Ottenhals* (Innsbruck, 1925), pp. 170 ff., says: "Zu den Problemen der Dichtung (HL) zählt auch ihre Beziehung zum Recht (p. 171)." He confines himself, however, in this brilliant article chiefly to the establishment of a new, legal interpretation of the form "wettu" in line 30: pledging, offering as security, mortgaging his flesh and blood, the father takes upon himself a legal obligation and becomes a hostage.

³ Interesting in this connection are the various translations made from time to time. E.g., according to Lachmann, Hildebrand leaves behind *three*. "Er verliesz im Lande elend sitzen Die Frau im Hause, unerwachsenes Kind, Erblos (er ritt gen Osten fort) das Volk [cited from O. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte der Kritik und Erklärung des Hildebrandsliedes*, Gymnasialprogramm Naumburg a. S., 1876, pp. 9 and 11], according to Gering,

the introduction to his "Beitrage zur Erklarung des Hildebrandsliedes".

Mein erster grundsatz wird der sein, mich so genau wie moglich an den uberlieferten text des liedes zu halten und denselben in ungesuchter weise—ohne mich von anderen sagen- oder geschichtsquellen beeinflussen zu lassen—zu erklaren und zu ubersetzen⁴

But even the systematic and painstaking study of "outside material" such as represented e. g. by B. Busse, "Sagengeschichtliches zum Hildebrandslied," *Paul-Braune Beitrage*, xxvi (1901), 1-92, and by G. Ehrismann, "Zum Hildebrandslied," *Paul-Braune Beitrage*, xxxii (1907), 260-92, apparently has shed no light on the legal problem in lines 20-22a, except in the case of Franz Saran's investigation of the HL in 1915, Saran complains that the interest in the purely philological aspects of the HL and the interest in the story material ("Stoff") have prevented the literary historian from doing his real task in connection with the HL, viz. that of working up the thought content of the poem and of assigning the poem its proper place in the spiritual and intellectual movements of the last decade of the eighth century A. D.⁵ Yet in spite of his invective against the emphasis placed on what he calls minor aspects of the HL, Saran refers to the author of the HL as constantly alluding to Frankish-feudal conditions and as being in all likelihood one of the educated contemporaries of Charles the Great.⁶ And thus it is Saran who, in my opinion, has made in spite of himself the only worthwhile contribution "from the outside" to our passage when he calls attention to the distichs which Paulus Diaconus penned in 782 A. D. (at about the time when the Hildebrandslied was written down) and which he submitted to Charles the Great in order to

Hildebrand leaves behind *two* Er liesz im Lande elend zuruck die Frau im Hause, das Kind unerwachsen, das erblose [*Zeitschrift fur deutsche Philologie* xxvi (1894), p. 465], according to Kluge, Hildebrand leaves behind *one* Er liesz daheim bei der Hausfrau den kindjungen Knaben arm an Erbgutern [F. Kluge, *Hildebrandslied, Ludwigslied und Merseburger Zauberspruche* Deutschkundliche Bucherei (Leipzig, 1919), p. 63, cf. p. 21]

⁴ *Goteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift* ix (1903), no. 4, p. 3

⁵ Franz Saran, *Das Hildebrandslied* "Bausteine zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur," ed. Franz Saran, xv (Halle a. S., 1915), pp. 2 and 163

⁶ Saran, *o. c.*, pp. 185 (top) and 164 (bottom), cf. G. Neckel in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* xxxvii (1916), coll. 1842-3.

arouse the king's mercy for his exiled brother Arichis.⁷ In this poem, Paul the Deacon describes the piteous estate of the wife and children and sister of the man in exile

- 9 Illius in patria coniunx miseranda per omnes
- 10 Mendicat plateas, ore tremante cibos
- 11 Quattuor hac turpi natos sustentat ab arte,
- 12 Quos vix pannucius praevallet illa tegi
- 13 Est mihi, quae primis Christo sacrata sub annis
- 14 Excubat, egregia simplicitate soror
- 15 Haec sub sorte pari luctum sine fine retentans
- 16 Privata est oculis iam prope flendo suis
- 17 Quantulacunque fuit, direpta est nostra supellex,
- 18 Nec est, heu, miseris qui ferat ullus opem

⁷ Saran, *o c.*, p. 141—Prior to Saran, Ehrismann had in *Paul-Braune Beträge* xxxii (1907), p. 279, cited for line 20 no. 8 of the Salomon Formulae, claiming that this formula furnishes specific directions, valid for such cases as the one under discussion. In my opinion, the wording of no. 8 renders it inapplicable to our situation. The Salomon Formulae are published in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Legum Sectio V Formulae, I Formulae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi* (ed. K. Zeumer [Hanover, 1886]), pp. 390 ff. There they appear together as "Collectio Sangallensis Salomonis III tempore conscripta." No. 8, on pp. 401-2, bears the title "karta illius, qui, in bellum profecturus vel ubicumque, matrem cum uxore, cum filio vel filia parvula reliquerit, et hereditatem suam omnibus cognatis suis acclinem et redemtibilem ad monasterium delegaverit"—The formulae bearing the name of Salomon III may have existed prior to his time (890-920 A.D.), they may have existed at the time when the HL was written down. According to the evidence, they were *collected* at the time (and probably at the behest) of Salomon III. But no. 8 does not advise a man on his way into exile how to deed his property to one or the other member of his family. The man is on his way to war ("in bellum profecturus"). "Vel ubicumque" must mean "going on a journey to transact business or to make a pilgrimage." In the context it certainly does not mean "going into exile." A portion of formula no. 8 will make this clear. Ego N, incertitudinem huius vitae perpendens, trado ad monasterium Sancti Galli, quicquid proprietatis in Durgewe in illis et in illis N locis habeo, cui sacratissimo loco reverentissimus abba N praeesse dinoscitur. Ea tamen ratione res supradictas trado, ut, si, Deo miserante, sanus in patriam fuero regressus, quamdiu voluero, sub censu unius denarii possideam, redemptione mihi sub 4 denariis, quandocumque voluero, concessa. Quod si ego illic interfectus vel defunctus fuero, tunc mater mea tertiam partem earundem rerum usque ad diem exitus sui possideat et censum inde ad praefatum monasterium 2 denarios persolvat. Reliquas autem duas partes quondam uxor mea cum parvulo filio, vel filia mea, dies vitae suae possideant et tantidem census ad ipsum monasterium reddant. Et si matri

- 19 Coniunx est fratris rebus exclusa paternis,
 20 Iamque sumus servis rusticitate pares
 21 Nobilitas perit miseris, accessit aegestas
 22 Debuimus, fateor, asperiora pati
 23 Sed miserere, potens rector, miserere, precamur,
 24 Et tandem finem his pie pone malis
 25 Captivum patriae redde et civilibus aivis,
 26 Cum modicis rebus culmina redde simul,
 27 Mens nostra ut Christo laudes in secla frequentet,
 28 Reddere qui solus praemia digna potest⁸

As even more pertinent to HL 20-22a than the distichs of Paulus Diaconus I submit two *decreta* which are approximately contemporary with the writing down of the HL. These two *decreta* are the *decretum Compendiense* and the *decretum Vermeriense Pippini*. I have not found them cited in the literature on the HL. This may be due to my admittedly incomplete check of the critical literature. It may be due also to the fact that the two *decreta* were noted, but were not quoted, intentionally, because they were considered irrelevant to the passage under discussion. I do not claim that the two *decreta* change the understanding of HL 20-22a radically. They do show, however, in my opinion, that an ecclesiastic such as the one (or ones) who wrote down the HL could very well have pictured Hildebrand a) as a man who went into exile *without consulting his wife as to whether she wished to join him or not*, or b) as a man *who had asked his wife to join him on his journey into exile and who had received a negative answer*. In other words, the scribe or

meae superstites facti fuerint, et ipsam portionem ad se recipiant et 4 denarios ad monasterium reddant. Quod si idem orphanus meus ad virilem pervenerit aetatem et legitimam duxerit uxorem,—Quod si eadem orphana mea ad nubilem pervenerit aetatem et legitimo viro nupserit, licentiam habeat uno solido redimendi. Si autem ille ante obierit, fratres mei eo pacto easdem possessiones redimere debeant, si ipso orphano meo, dum adhuc viveret, omnem humanitatem et dilectionem exhibuerunt, et uterque eorum una libra argenti redimant. — Formula no 8 deals with the exigencies that may arise when a man in full possession of his civil rights disposes of his real estate. Hence, I repeat, the Salomon Formula no 8 is not applicable to HL 20, where, to say the least, Hildebrand's full possession of civil rights is certainly very much in doubt.

⁸ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Poetarum Latinorum Mediae Aevi Tomi I Pars Prior* (Berlin, 1880) no x of the poems by Paulus Diaconus, pp. 47-8, cf. p. 28.

scribes at the end of the eighth century might very well have asked the question does "furlaet" mean *dimisit* or does it mean *reliquit*?

Assuming the possibility of these two technical, legal meanings of "furlaet," I am, of course, forced to accept Lachmann's explanation of "prut" as accusative singular *dimisit* or *reliquit uxorem* or *novam nuptam*. And I must reject Holtzmann's emendation according to which "prut" stands for "pruti" (genetive singular). Since it is evident to me that young Hadubrand does not wish to censure his presumably dead father as one who has left his wife and small child to a cruel fate at the hands of a hostile prince, I translate "furlaet" by *reliquit*, i. e. Hildebrand asked his wife to join him on his journey into exile, but he received a negative answer. The reason for her negative answer may easily be divined: it was the small child, too small to be taken along on the flight to the East Country. Such a reason is certainly not less potent, if not less valid, than the reasons for not accompanying the husband, given in the *decretum Vermeriense Pippini*.

Situations a) and b) must have arisen not altogether infrequently. Else the two *decreta* would not have been formulated. The fact that the two *decreta* deal with divorce and remarriage and only incidentally with exile and property disposal render them not less pertinent in my opinion.

The *decretum Compendiense* is dated 757 A. D. and the *decretum Vermeriense Pippini* a little later. They are most easily accessible in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Legum Sectio II Capitularia Regum Francorum I* (ed. A. Boretius [Hanover, 1883]), pp. 39 and 41 respectively.

The pertinent sections follow

Cap. Compendiense c. 21. si qui propter faidam fugiunt in alias patrias et dimittunt uxores suas, nec illi viri nec illae feminae accipiant coniugium⁹

Cap. Vermeriense c. 9. si quis necessitate inevitabili cogente in alium ducatum seu provinciam fugerit aut seniore suum, cui fidem mentiri non potuerit, secutus fuerit, et uxor eius, cum valet et potest, amore parentum aut suis rebus eum sequi noluerit, ipsa omni tempore, quamdiu vir eius quem secuta non fuit vivet, semper innupta

⁹ Cf. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Legum I* (ed. G. H. Pertz [Hanover, 1835]), pp. 27-9. c. 21 is on p. 29. Here is added, as *varia lectio*, to c. 21: Georgius consentit

permaneant Nam ille vir eius, qui necessitate cogente in alium locum fugit, si se abstinere non potest, aliam uxorem cum poenitentia potest accipere.¹⁰

JOHN G. KUNSTMANN

The University of Chicago

OLD FRENCH *BELLURÉ*

Old French *belluré* is listed as a *hapax* in the dictionary of Tobler-Lommatzsch¹ which merely cites its occurrence in *La Vers de la Mort* (stanza 52, 11) and offers no translation or explanation

Uns jours venra, dont peu curés,
Qui a tous ert si *bellurés*,
N'arés parent qui ne vous laie

The word in this passage had been previously noted as a *hapax* by Godefroy (*Dict.*, I, 618 b), who says of it "employé pour signifier au sujet duquel on est trompé, imprévu"

Here is a second example of *belluré*, also in rhyme, unknown to Godefroy and Tobler-Lommatzsch. It appears in a manuscript² of the *fabliau* *Del Sot chevalier* which was not utilized by Montaiglon and Raynaud³ in their edition

245 Puis a les deus traus mesurés
Il ne fu mie *bellurés*
Qu'il n'ait tant contre mont erciet
Qu'il a au plus lonc aderciet

¹⁰ See also *decretum Compendiense* c 9 and cf. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Legum* I, p 23, where the last sentence reads *nam ille vir eius, qui necessitate cogente in alium locum fugit [si numquam in suam patriam se reversurum sperat], si se abstinere non potest etc*—For the relationship existing between the *decretum Compendiense* and the *decretum Vermeriense* and the ecclesiastical aspects of regulation of divorce and remarriage etc see Heinrich Mitteis, *Lehnrecht und Staatsgewalt Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Weimar, 1933), p 44

¹ *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, Berlin, 1925, I, 913 a.

² Cf. *Report of the Manuscripts of Lord Middleton preserved at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire* (Historical Manuscripts Commission), Hereford, 1911, folio 342 verso b of the ms. described on p 233 f.

³ *Recueil général des fabliaux*, Paris, 1872, I, 220 f

The passage in the text of Montaiglon et Raynaud which corresponds to these verses reads as follows

243. Puis a les || traus mesurez,
Il ne fu mie si dervez
Que tant ne l'ait traite et tracie
Qu'il a la piaucele percie,

Verses 246-248 of the unpublished version develop more naturally the sense of the common verse *Puis a les || traus mesurés*, than do verses 244-246 of the printed text, and verse 248 of the former offers a sequence to it. The published text seems like an awkward adaptation of the other to avoid such rare or dialectal words as *bellurés*, *erciet* and *aderciet*. Besides, *bellurés* satisfies the rich rhyme which is a decided feature of the poems of Gautier Le Leu, author of the *fabliau*.⁴ It seems certain that it was a part of the original.

Windahl in the glossary to his edition of *Li Vers de la Mort*⁵ explains *bellurés* "part pass 52, 11. Je pense que c'est le pc du verbe *belluer*, *bellwer*" This is followed by a (T) which evidently means that Tobler shares his opinion, for he says in his introduction that Tobler has helped him with his difficulties in the text. It is curious to note that *belluer* and *belliver* are here considered to be one and the same verb. They are listed in the dictionaries of Godefroy and Tobler-Lommatzsch as two different verbs, and this seems to be logical, for *belluer* (*besluer* < **bislucare*), *verblenden*, *falsch sehen* (Tob.-Lom.), which is transitive in the two known cases, is to be related to *bellue*, *berlue* (**bisluca*),⁶ whereas *bellwer*, *beslwer schrag laufen* (Tob.-Lom.), which is always intransitive, is to be derived from L. *obliquare* with prefix substitution *bis-* for *ob-*,⁷ or is constructed upon *besluf*.⁸

From the semantic point of view *belluré*, taken as past participle

⁴ Cf *RR*, xv (1924), 20

⁵ Lund, 1887, p 138

⁶ W Meyer-Lubke, *Rom. Etym. Wörterb.* 3d ed, no 1127, and G Tilander, *Dérivés méconnus du latin lua, lucem*, in *Minneskrift utiöven av Filologisk Samfundet*, Göteborg, 1925, 160 and 161. Tilander supposes the existence of a *berluer* < **bislucare* without identifying it with *belluer*, *besluer*, as we have

⁷ Meyer-Lubke, *op cit*, no 6013

⁸ G Tilander, *Notes étymologiques* in *Mélanges A. Thomas*, Paris, 1927, 466

or participial adjective, equivalent to *beslwé*, fits our passages perfectly. So interpreted, verses 246 f. of the *fabliau* would mean "he did not at all go *crooked* (*bellurés*), but on the contrary went upwards in such a way that he attained the longest hole." The passage of *Li Vers de la Mort* could be translated: "A day will come which will be so *critical* or *dangerous* (*bellurés*) that you will have no relative who will not abandon you." It is true that here we have given to *bellurés* (*beslwés*) a figurative sense *critical* or *dangerous*, but the use of *belif* in the following passage from the *Roman des romans*⁹ justifies such an interpretation.

Ha las' dolent tant par eimes charitif,
Quant nostre vie veons en tel *belif*!¹⁰
Ja l'endemain n'en serrons plus pensif

An explanation of the form *belluré* (= *beslwé*) is suggested if we examine *delurer*¹¹ a rare variant of *delvrer*. Verbs of which the first syllable is *bes* usually have simple forms *bes-tondre*, *bes-torner*, *bes-cuire*, *bes-jugier*, *bes-order*, *bes-tencier*, *bes-tordre* (cf also *besillier*, *essillier*, *bescochier*, *descochier*), but there was no simplex *lwer* (*bes-lwer*), nor was there a compound *beslvrer* (*bes + lvrer*). *Beslvrer* may then have been popularly construed to be a compound of *lvrer*. This analogical form **beslvrer* (= *beslwer*) could well have had a dialectal or popular variant *beslurer* (*bellurer*), just as *delvrer* had such a variant *delurer*, and this would explain the past participle or participial adjective *belluré* of our texts.¹²

Delurer (*delvrer*) seems to show the passing of the labial ele-

⁹ Ed Tanqueray, Paris, 1922, v 239 f (cited by Tob-Lom)

¹⁰ Tob-Lom I, 941 b, explains *belif* in this passage as *fig Gefahr*; Godefroy interprets it (I, 616 b) as *situation critique*. *Belif* (*beslif*) used with prepositions *de*, *a en* has the literal sense *schräg*, *de biais*, *de travers*.

¹¹ In a ms of the *Roman de Renart*, cf G Tilander, *Notes sur le texte du roman de Renart*, *Zeits f rom phil*, XLIV, 681.

¹² Analogies of this sort give rise to a bewildering number of variants in the verb system of Old French, especially in the dialects *grembre*, *geindre*; *escrire*, *escrire*, *beivre*, *boire*, etc. *L tremere* is represented in the old language by *criembre*, *criendre*, *craindre*, *cremer*, *cremur*, *cremour*; cf past participles in *-ectus* on the pattern of *collectus colloct*, dialectal infinitives such as *cheir*, *veïr*, *seïr* in the east and northeast, dialectal forms of *poour*: *poulons*, *poulez*, *pulent*, etc, etc. Verbs in *-lwer* and *-lvrer* are both rare but *lvrer*, *delvrer* are of very frequent occurrence.

ment in *vr* over into the rounding of the vowel *i* > *u*. This phenomenon is common from early times in Anglo-Norman,¹³ and was not unknown on the continent,¹⁴ but in both cases appears more frequently after back vowels, although is not limited to this position. This feature is difficult of demonstration because of the unique sign *u* for *u* and *v* in medieval mss, the influence of the literary language, and in the case of *-vr* > *-ur*, because of the rarity of words in rhyme containing it.

In any case, to sum up, the existence of a second example of *bellurés* in the *fabliau* confirms the *bellurés* of *Li Vers de la Mort*. They are, we believe, dialectal or popular forms of *bellvés* (*beslvés*) with which they concur in sense. The two texts in which *bellurés* is established by rich rhyme, were written in the 13th century, *Li Vers de la Mort* in the Artois, the *fabliau* in Hamaut.

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

Bowdoin College

¹³ Cf the forms of the Oxford ms of the *Chanson de Roland* *jo murra* 311, *jo murra* 1867. Stimming, *Der Anglonormannische Boeve de Haumtone* (*Bibliotheca Normannica* vii), Halle, 1899, 219, gives many examples. The phenomenon is not restricted to *vr* > *ur* after back vowels. cf. *eschure* = *eschivre* in a *fabliau* in Anglo-Norman (Mont et Rayn, *op cit*, ii, 226).

¹⁴ The phenomenon is not studied in the grammars. A. T. Baker, *Romania*, LXIII (1937), 1 f, shows with considerable probability that *aurar*, *saurar* are very old forms. Cf. Mont et Rayn, *op cit*, ii, 211, 425-426. *euvre mure* (= *meuvre*) from a Walloon ms, Baudouin de Condé (ed. Scheler), i, 428. *deseure* (= *desevre*) *deseure* (adv.) That the *v* was at least weak in this position (*-vr-*) in some regions of the northeast, appears from such scribal notations as *enquerre oevre* (Gilles Li Munsis, ed. K. de Lattenhove, i, 37, 33) and *oevre noire* (Mont et Rayn, *op cit*, ii, 202, 151-152), cf. also *estera* = *estevra* (*Li Regres Nostre Dame*, ed. Langfors, p. 103) and *estora*, *estera* (Wace), *estouura* (*Partonopeus*) where *ouu* is one syllable—all cited by Godefroy (*estovour*). Tülander, *Zeits f. rom. phil.*, XLIV, 678, notes a number of rhymes in a ms of the *Renart* where *v* in *-vr-* has no value for the rhyme. The modern patois know this transformation of the *v*, after front and back vowels: cf. *loure*, *lovre* (*lucubra*) in the east (Horning in *Zeits f. rom. phil.*, XVIII, 213, *Romania*, XXIX, 119), *deseurer* (*desevrer*) in Picardy (Godefroy, ii, 655 a).

THE IDENTITY OF 'M. T. COYFURELLE'

'M. T. Coyfurelly' has long been a mystery. He is known to have been the author or editor of a *Tractatus orthographie gallicane*, of which there are two extant copies, both in England.¹ Attention was attracted to him in 1878 and 1879, when E. Stengel published two articles² identifying him as the author of *La manière de langage qui t'enseignera bien et droit parler et escrire doulz françois*. One copy³ of this work had been recognized and studied by Paul Meyer in 1870.⁴ The second copy⁵ was found by Stengel and resulted in his assignment of the authorship to 'M. T. Coyfurelly,' concerning whom he was able to learn nothing new.⁶ The British Museum authorities have no further information. There is a date, 1396, on the British Museum manuscript,⁷ but it is that of a copy made at Bury-St Edmund's in that year, by a copyist whose name appears on the same page. The question came up again in 1926, when Royster pointed out that the *Manière de langage* mentioned Chaucer's famous magician, 'Colle Tregetour' and the practice of the Black Art in Orléans at the end of the fourteenth century.⁸

As far as I have been able to discover, there is no conclusive proof that 'Coyfurelly' wrote the *Manière de langage*, but neither is there any proof of the contrary, and Stengel's case for him is a very strong one. One of his arguments is that internal evidence shows the author to have been completely familiar with Orléans and its

¹ British Museum, *MS Harl 4971*, Oxford, Magdalen College *MS 188*

² 'The earliest French grammars,' *Athenaeum*, no 2658 (1878), 433, 'Die ältesten Anleitungsschriften zur Erlernung der französischen Sprache,' *ZNSL*, I (1879), 1 ff

³ British Museum, *MS Harl 3988*, fol 1-26r

⁴ *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature*, 5ème année, 2ème semestre (1870, extra number, appeared 1873), 373 ff

⁵ Oxford, All Souls College *MS 182*, fol. 305-316, 372v-373v My attention has just been called to an unpublished thesis in the University of London, Jennifer Nicholson, *A contribution to the study of French as taught in England, XIIIth-XVth centuries*, which was abstracted for me by Miss Muriel Campbell, with kind permission of the author and of the director of the Library. Miss Nicholson has seen four additional copies, not all complete. British Museum *MS Additional 17716*, fol 106r-111v, Cambridge University Library *MS Dd 1223*, 70v-74v, Bibliothèque Nationale *MS Nouv Acq Fran.* 699 Cambridge, Trinity College Library, *MS B 13 40*, fol 179r-v

⁶ *ZNSL*, I, 23

⁷ *MS Harl. 3988 70a.*

⁸ J. F. Royster, 'Colle Tregetour,' *SP*, XXIII (1926), 380 ff

university,⁹ a fact noted previously by Meyer¹⁰ and later by Royster.¹¹ 'Coyfurelly,' a graduate of the university, and identified as the author by other means, would of course qualify on this point. Can his claim to an Orléans degree and a benefice in Orléans be proven?

There was a person of that name, either a Scot or an Englishman, of whom there are at least six contemporary records, four among the documents of the University of Orléans and two from the Cathedral archives of the city. The initial 'M' is the abbreviation for 'Magister' on the university rolls. The given name is 'Thomas,' and the last name 'Coyfurrel' or 'Coiferrel,' and 'Coyfurelly' or 'Coiferrelli' in the genitive. This name does not appear to be French, and may have been an attempt at a French translation of the English 'Barbour'

Thomas Coyfurrel was a resident of Orléans at various times, perhaps constantly, between 1393 and 1421. I have been unable to find a record of his arrival, departure, or death. Our first mention of him, in 1393, is on a roll of members of the University of Orléans prepared for Pope Clement VII.¹² These rolls were sent to Rome or Avignon from time to time, but not at regular intervals. They listed professors, students, and servants, and those graduates who lived in or near Orléans and kept up an official connection with the university.¹³ Inscription on such a roll constituted fairly reliable proof of residence in Orléans. Coyfurrel's name appeared on a roll of 1393,¹⁴ and again the following year,¹⁵ both times as a licentiate and graduate. He was not on the last previous roll, sent to the Pope in 1378.¹⁶ There are no other extant rolls among the Vatican records for the possible years of his lifetime.

A similar list was drawn up for the civil authorities in 1412,

⁹ ZNSL, I, 7-8

¹⁰ *Revue Critique*, *op cit*, pp 377-378

¹¹ *SP*, xxiii, 380 ff

¹² Vatican Archives, *Clement VII (antip) Reg Suppl an xv*, fol 186-200 Cf M Fournier, *Les statuts des universités françaises*, Paris, 1890-4, III, 467 ff. Another roll of the same year, fol 200 ff supplements this

¹³ Apparently to enjoy the university privilege of tax-exemption for members

¹⁴ Twentieth among the licentiates Cf Fournier, III, 470

¹⁵ Vatican Archives, *Benedict XIII (antip) Reg expectatarum, an I, pars VI*, fol 221 ff. Cf Fournier, III, 474 ff. Coyfurrel is seventeenth of the licentiates Cf Fournier, III, 477

¹⁶ Vatican Archives, *Clement VII (antip) Reg Suppl an I, pars unica*, fol 109 ff. Cf. Fournier, III, 459 ff

showing persons who had enjoyed the university privilege of tax-exemption during the year, and what each had imported free of duty.¹⁷ Thomas Coyfurrel was on that list.¹⁸ He had imported eight muids of high quality grain.

In a document of 1421, Coyfurrel's name appears in the *Book of the Scottish Nation at Orléans*.¹⁹ He was among the canons of the Cathedral present at the foundation ceremony of a mass for John Stuart of Darnley, Constable of the Scots Guard in France. The Scottish Nation of the university took an official part in the ceremony, and wrote a complete description of it in a part of their *Liber Nationis* reserved for special entries. The appearance of Coyfurrel's name is not proof of Scottish nationality,²⁰ but suggests it. There were frequently Scottish canons at Orléans, and at least one Scottish bishop.²¹ The evidence in this document proves only that he was beneficed canon of the Cathedral of Sainte Croix of Orléans.²²

A learned librarian of the public library in Orléans has tabulated the names of all canons of Orléans whose names are to be found in several manuscript necrologies of the Cathedral.²³ He gives two

¹⁷ Bibliothèque Nationale (*Collection Bastard d'Estang*, Nouv. acq. fran. 3638, item 129). Cf. J. Loiseleur, 'Les privilèges de l'université de lois d'Orléans,' *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique et Historique de l'Orléanais*, xxii (1889), 21 ff.

¹⁸ Item 73.

¹⁹ *Liber Nationis Scoeie*, Vatican Library, *Cod. Reg. Lat. 405*, fol. 11r-12v. Cf. J. Kirkpatrick, 'The Scottish Nation at the University of Orléans, 1336-1538,' *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, II (1904), 74-78, 91-94.

²⁰ Eight canons and two dignitaries attended the ceremony, no nationality being mentioned. Coyfurrel's name does not appear elsewhere in the *Liber Nationis Scoeie*. Names of members of the Nation were not usually inscribed unless they represented the Nation at a recorded ceremony, or signed proctor's oaths. There are no extant rolls of members of the Scottish Nation, therefore the absence of a name proves nothing.

²¹ John Carmichael, known in France as Kirkmichel, or Jean de Saint-Michel. Cf. *Gallia Christiana*, vii, 1477.

²² There were ten resident canons and forty-six titular canons at the Cathedral. Cf. A. de Foulques de Villaret, 'Recherches historiques sur l'ancien Chapitre cathédral de l'Eglise d'Orléans,' *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique et Historique de l'Orléanais*, xix (1883), 507.

²³ Ch. Cuissard, 'Les chanoines et dignitaires de la Cathédrale d'Orléans,' *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique et Historique de l'Orléanais*, xxviii (1902), 106 ff. I have not been able to examine these necrologies. Formerly at the Episcopal Palace, they have been removed to the Archives du Loiret at Orléans. I am indebted to M. Jacques Soyer, retired director of the Archives, and the Reverend Georges Chenesseau, Professor of Modern

mentions of Thomas Coyfurrel, one in 1419, and one in 1421. The second may be a Cathedral record of the Darnley foundation. One interesting fact appears in these items, that Coyfurrel was a man of some means, an owner of property in Orléans, for he willed an interest in two houses to the Cathedral, one in the 'vico de la Closerie' ²⁴ and the other in the 'vico Parvi Putei' ²⁵

It thus appears that there was a Thomas Coyfurrel, a beneficed canon of the Cathedral of Sainte Croix and a property owner, who was resident in the city of Orléans at least in the years 1393, 1394, 1412, 1419, and 1421.²⁶ His name suggests that he was not French, and the name, as well as the internal evidence in the *Manière*, suggest that he came from an English-speaking country. Stengel and Meyer therefore assumed that he was English.²⁷ It is unlikely that an Englishman would hold a benefice in Orléans in those years of strained relations, and since Scots frequently did hold such benefices, it is quite possible that he was Scottish rather than English. Like the 'M. T. Coyfurelle' author of the *Tractatus*, he was a priest and a Licentiate in Both Laws of the University of Orléans. It is scarcely possible that they are not one and the same person. If they are identical, Stengel's argument that Coyfurrel wrote the *Manière de langage* becomes more plausible than ever. Coyfurrel was exactly the type of person Stengel thought he would prove to be, an English-speaking author with an Orléans degree, capable of writing a guide for English-speaking students, and one who was thoroughly familiar with the Orléans scene. Furthermore, his dates make it perfectly possible for him to have written the *Manière de langage* in time for a copy to have been made at Bury in 1396.²⁸

Duke University

DOROTHY MACKAY QUINN

History at the Institut Catholique of Paris, for valuable notes corroborating Cuissard's work

²⁴ Perhaps the Rue du Cloître Sainte Croix, still in existence. It was then within the Cathedral Close, and may have been Coyfurrel's residence as a canon

²⁵ The Rue du Petit Puits, still in existence

²⁶ Monsieur Soyer, who has examined the necrologies, says that neither his appointment nor his death are recorded by date

²⁷ *ZNSL*, I, 10, *Revue Critique*, op. cit., 373-374, 378

²⁸ The material in this paper is part of a study of the history of the University of Orléans. The writer is grateful to the American Association of University Women for a Fellowship, and to the American Council of Learned Societies and the Duke University Research Council for grants in aid, which made the research possible

LA GALA DEL NADAR—DATE AND AUTHORSHIP¹

La gala del nadar es saber guardar la ropa was published in 1672 under Moreto's name,² but there is every reason to think that it was written before 1628 and every reason to doubt that Moreto ever put pen to it. Some years ago I questioned³ its attribution to him, pointing out that its characteristics were those of the late Lopean period, but as I could not support the theory with external evidence nor adduce other critical authority to support my opinion, I did not definitely remove the play from his theatre.

La gala del nadar is mentioned in at least two of Calderón's works *El alcalde de Zalamea* and *Luis Pérez el gallego*. Neither of these plays was published until 1651,⁴ but the latter was written by December 21st, 1628, for at that date it was represented by Antonio de Prado.⁵ In the former play one finds the following lines (II, xxiii, 79)

Rebolledo Ten esas capas
Chispa Que es *del reñir*, imagino,
 la gala al guardar la ropa,
 aunque *del nadar* se dijo

Rebolledo, foreseeing a fight, gives his cape in safekeeping in circumstances that are not unlike those which lead Rugeio to protect his clothes.⁶ In *Luis Pérez el gallego*, the idea becomes less literal, less tentative, and more cumulative (III, II, 455).

¹ A fellowship from the A. A. U. W. in 1937-38 made possible this note.

² *Escogidas*, Parte xxxviii, Madrid, Lucas Antonio de Bedmar. It has never been reprinted.

³ *Dramatic Art of Moreto*, Northampton, Mass., 1931-32, p. 147.

⁴ *El mejor de los mejores libros*, Alcalá. *El alcalde de Zalamea* there has the name of *El garrote más bien dado*. References in this study are to the respective BAE editions, xii, ix.

⁵ See H. Rennert, "Notes on the Chronology of the Spanish Drama," *MLR*, III (1907-1908), 45. The date of *El alcalde* is uncertain, but I suspect it to have been written about the same time. Both are characterised by youthful pugnacity, and both are in the Lopean tradition rather than the manner that was to distinguish Calderón's later plays. However, *El alcalde* has usually been assigned to the early 1640's.

⁶ When Ricardo invites Rugeio to go swimming in Fontainebleau with the intention of having him drowned, the latter, warned of his treachery, appears with his fiancée and several men who are placed there ostensibly to "guard his cape and sword."

*del nadar y el reñir
el guardar la ropa fué
la gala*

It might be argued that both of these references could be to a popular proverb of the day, but given the similarity of its setting in this play and Calderón's, together with the fact that one does not find it in Covarrubias or Correas, that seems hardly probable. The *refrán* would seem to have originated with this play. In the *Diccionario de la lengua* (1739) under *gala* one finds "La gala del nadar es saber guardar la ropa Refrán con que se significa que en qualquier cosa o negocio lo más preciso es atender a no padecer algún daño u detrimento" This, both in form and idea, tallies perfectly with the play under discussion

There is still further reason to think this play was written in the twenties, probably the very early twenties or even during the last half of the second decade. It was, in my opinion, done at a time when the Spanish and French courts had an interest in each other and were even determined to like one other. This was the situation in the last days of Philip III's and the first years of Philip IV's reign when by a double wedding Spain acquired a French queen and France a Spanish one. When the curtain goes up, Flora, the heroine, is in the country near Fontainebleau awaiting the return of the count Rugero who has gone to arrange the wedding of his prince, Ricardo, with the Spanish princess, Elvira—a reflection, perhaps, of Luis XIII's union with Ana of Spain in 1615. On his return the following conversation (of which I can quote only a small part) takes place between Rugero's servant and the heroine (I, 170).

<i>Flora</i>	¿Cómo por España os fué?
<i>Ramón</i>	Es estremado país
<i>Flora</i>	¿Aficionados venís?
<i>Ramón</i>	Aficionados, no sé, porque tengo para mí que el mundo, cual mas, cual menos, componen malos y buenos, pues las mismas cosas vi Hay sabios e ignorantes, hay cuerdos, Flora, y hay locos, falsos muchos, finos pocos

This is the answer of a cosmopolite who refuses to entertain national

prejudices. He has forgotten the Pyrenees. It is improbable that it was written after 1625, the date when Richelieu sent his soldiers into the Valtelline and thereby strained relations with Spain. They remained so until well into Charles II's reign.

There is a third reason for linking this play with the period indicated. One finds what is an apparent reference to Montalbán's *La más constante mujer* (I, 172), published for the first time in his *Para todos* (1632), but very conceivably written several years earlier.

Who is the author? Not Moreto, who was not born until 1618. In many ways the play recalls Lope, though such international tolerance is not particularly characteristic of him. The plot is, in fact, the same in its general situation as that of Lope's *El hombre de bien*,⁷ much as they differ in development. In both plays, while out hunting, a young man of royal blood happens upon a beautiful woman dressed in peasant clothes. He falls madly in love with her and seeks ways of winning her to his will. In both he asks his courtier to plead his cause, not knowing that the latter has for many moons been the accepted lover of the heroine. In both the hero is the one appointed to go to the boundary line of his country in order to bring back the royal bride of his liegeland. And finally, in both there are scenes of jealousy and mutual recrimination which end only when the royal rival forgets his unworthy designs and becomes godfather at the marriage of the lovers.

The characterization is quite Lopean, particularly that of the men and of the heroine, Flora. Rosela (niece to the king who is likewise in love with the protagonist) is, however, of gentler spiritual contours than are most of this dramatist's women. In its mechanics, it is thoroughly Lopean. Like so many of his *comedras*,

⁷ Written between 1599 and 1606. See C. Bruerton, "Lope's Belardo-Lucinda Plays," *Hispanic Review*, v (1937), 310. First published in Lope's *Sexta Parte*, Madrid, Juan de la Cuesta, 1616. Interestingly enough the phrase, *hombre de bien*, occurs four times in *Luis Pérez el gallego*: II, 19, 454; III, 2, 455, 3, 456, 5, 456. Could Calderón have just been reading Lope's play? The phrase is apparently used here, as in the earlier comedy, to mean a man of gentle birth who is physically courageous. According to Luján y Verdugo's *Avisos de los peligros que hay en la vida de corte* (Madrid, 1621), it had acquired a special meaning in Sevilla: "un gentil-hombre mancebo, de buen talle, entre estudiante y valiente, de los que comienzan en Sevilla a ganar nombre de *hombres de bien*." See ed. Manuel de Sandoval, Madrid, 1923, p. 152.

the beginning is forceful and attractive, but the second and third acts show marked inferiority. The versification is characteristic of his work between 1615 and 1628⁸. The style is at times strikingly similar. My own feeling in the matter is confirmed by a manuscript note which is found in Schaeffer's personal copy of his *Geschichte*⁹ at Freiburg-im-Breisgau. "*La gala del nadar* ist offenbar nach einem Stucke Lope de Vega's gearbeitet," and he cites in proof of his assertion Flora's long speech (pp 178-179) which begins. "Sean los celos fiscal . . ."

The author, whoever he may be, is a feminist in his point of view, and he is *anticulto*. In the second act (p. 176), we are asked

¿No has visto aquella figura
que poetas cultos llaman
transposición, que con ella
se transponen las palabras,
que para hallar el sentido
son menester dos semanas?

The dramatist may or may not be Lope, he is certainly of that school.

RUTH LEE KENNEDY

Smith College

MOLIÈRE IN FRANCHE-COMTÉ

The speedy conquest of Franche-Comté in 1668, by Louis XIV and Condé, occasioned loud praise of the King. To the stream of complimentary verse that poured forth, Molière brought his sonnet, "Au Roy, sur la conquête de la Franche-Comté," which was published for the first time in the 1670 edition of *Amphitryon*. As it did not appear in the first edition (1668) of this play, Mesnard suggests (ix, 584-5) that a recitation of the poem served to open a performance of the comedy, given some time after March 5, 1668, the date of the *achevé* of the first edition. The chances are, Mesnard further suggests, that Molière recited the piece at the second performance of *Amphitryon*, given for the King at Versailles from the 25th to the 29th of April, 1668.

The conquest had been without bloodshed and the Comtois would

⁸ For figures, see *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, p. 62. Cf. them with those of M. A. Buchanan's study, *The Chronology of Lope de Vega's Plays*, Toronto, 1922.

⁹ *Geschichte des spanischen Nationaldramas*, Leipzig, 1890.

have resigned themselves to becoming French subjects were it not for the disdainful attitude assumed by the invaders, which wounded their pride. Though ostensibly accepting their lot, they were not, therefore, without resentment. This resentment manifested itself in a host of satirical writings aimed at the Sun King and his sympathizers.¹ In the ranks of the latter came Molière, who received his share of chastisement in an anonymous parody made of his sonnet. This travesty, which to my knowledge has as yet received no attention, is extant in a manuscript (1055, fol 19v) at the Public Library of Besançon. The fact that this manuscript belongs to the second half of the eighteenth century² does not exclude the possibility of its having been composed around 1670 since parodies almost always immediately followed the work attacked. Moreover, as this type of literature was widespread, the parody in question could not have failed to make the rounds, in later manuscript copies, to enlist the sympathies of eighteenth century Comtois folk.

I give here the parody in point, as sent to me by M. Piquard, who assures me he has reproduced it exactly as found in the manuscript.³

¹ Cf. *Catalogue gén. des Mss des Bibl. publ., Bibl. de Besançon*, vols 32-3 ms 38, folios 89, 103, 117, 155, 351, 392, ms 906, f° 121, ms 1053, ms 1054, folios 5, 8, 65, ms 1055, folios 18, 19, 22.

² Cf. *ibid.*, xxxii, 704. I am indebted to M. Piquard of this library, who so kindly sent me a copy of the ms. in his own hand.

³ For the sake of convenience, we reproduce here Molière's sonnet as given in the Mesnard ed. (ix, 584-5) of the poet's works.

Sonnet

Ce sont faits inouïs, Grand Roi, que tes victoires!
 L'avenir aura peine à les bien concevoir,
 Et de nos vieux héros les pompeuses histoires
 Ne nous ont point chanté ce que tu nous fais voir.
 Quoi? presque au même instant qu'on te l'a vu résoudre,
 Voir toute une province unie à tes États!
 Les rapides torrents, et les vents, et la foudre,
 Vont-ils, dans leurs effets, plus vite que ton bras?
 N'attends pas, au retour d'un si fameux ouvrage,
 Des soins de notre muse un éclatant hommage
 Cet exploit en demande, il le faut avouer,
 Mais nos chansons, Grand Roi, ne sont pas si tôt prêtes,
 Et tu mets moins de temps à faire tes conquêtes
 Qu'il n'en faut pour les bien louer.

Le Sonnet de Molière imité

Ce sont des trahisons et non pas des victoires
 Que l'avenir jamais ne pourra concevoir
 Et de nos vieux filous les trompeuses histoires
 N'ont jamais inventé ce que tu nous fais voir
 Quoy, presque au mesme instant qu'on te l'a veu resoudre
 On voit une province unie a [sic] tes estats
 Ce ne sont pas les vents, les canons ny la poudre
 Mais tes Louis qui vont plus viste que tes bras
 N'attens pas au retour d'un si mechant ouvrage
 Des soins de nostre muse un éclatant homage
 Cet exploit n'en veut point, il le faut avouer
 Et nos chansons seront sans peine plustot prestes
 Que tu n'auras de temps pour faire tes emplettes
 Pour blamer un trompeur plustôt [sic] que le louer

Note that the author accuses Louis XIV of having bribed his way into Franche-Comté. This criticism is justly leveled for such was actually the case. It is known, for example, that the French had prepared the way by winning over, with promises of money, several of the most influential men in the province and especially the famous Jean de Watteville. If this parody was written soon after the publication, in 1670, of the actor-author's sonnet, we can accept it as evidence that Molière's fame was well established in Franche-Comté during his lifetime.

JOSEPH F. PRIVITERA

*Saint Louis University*SAINT-RÉAL'S *DON CARLOS* AND *PHÈDRE*, 1093-6

Saint-Réal's *nouvelle* was first published in 1672. Its reputation was great enough to have attracted Racine's attention, even if he had not begun, two or three years later, to work on a play that has a somewhat similar theme. His interest in crime may well have made him note the following remarks about the noblemen who conspired against Don Carlos:

Personne ne devient scelerat tout d'un coup. Il n'appartient pas à toutes sortes d'ames de resoudre une grande méchanceté la première fois qu'elle vient dans la pensée. On n'arrive au crime que par degrez, de mesme qu'à la vertu.¹

¹ Pp 33-4 in the edition of 1691 as reprinted by Albert Leitzmann, Halle,

In the dramatist's hands these prose sentences became

Quelques crimes toujours précèdent les grands crimes
 Quiconque a pu franchir les bornes légitimes
 Peut violer enfin les droits les plus sacrés,
 Ainsi que la vertu, le crime a ses degrés

There is nothing of the sort in the works that have been previously indicated as sources of *Phèdre*. Not only is the thought in the two passages the same, but in each case the psychological observation is presented three times and two concise statements are separated by one that is more elaborate. The last of Racine's four lines is an almost exact transposition into verse of Saint-Réal's third sentence. There is, however, a difference. Saint-Réal is making an analysis of crime. Racine, by putting the verses into the mouth of Hippolytus, makes them part of a plea for justice, part of an interview with his father that leads to his own condemnation and death. Instead of being a contribution to criminology, they are words filled with pathos.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE ON VOLTAIRE

Eight years after Voltaire's death, there appeared the second edition of the works of the "Tibulle français" who once passed for Voltaire's son. M. de Villette. This 1786 edition of the "Œuvres du Marquis de Villette" has a twofold importance. First and foremost, it can boast of three epistles in verse and eleven letters in prose of Voltaire. Yet, it has escaped the researches of Voltaire's bibliographer. Bengesco only states that the eleven letters and the first epistle addressed to Villette ("Mon Dieu, que vos rimes en-ine") are printed in the 1788 edition of Villette's works, which, according to him, apparently even lacks the two other epistles dedicated to the Marquis ("Fleuve heureux du Léthé, j'allai passer ton onde" and "Adieu, mon cher Tibulle"). It is therefore of interest to learn that the 1786 edition seemingly overlooked by the

Niemeyer, 1914. I have compared the passage with a copy of the edition of 1672 in the Library of Congress and have found the two texts identical.

famed scholar contains all three epistles in addition to the letters.¹ Quérard's Voltaire bibliography also omits this edition entirely. In Quérard's Villette bibliography, the author describes the 1786 edition, without saying where and by whom it was published.² Furthermore, no mention is made of Voltaire's letters and epistles contained therein.³

Jealously guarded by an ardent bibliophile, the copy that recently attracted my attention has 156 pages, 4 loose pages being inserted in front, and is in 16mo. The original binding is well preserved, except for a part of the back, which has been renovated. While the frontispiece indicates London, both the clean, graceful type and the solidity of the paper and binding are sufficient evidence that the book comes from the press of the alleged publisher of Voltaire's "Pucelle" Hubert-Martin Cazin in Paris. Cazin specialized in publishing prohibited books. Turning to account Voltaire's often repeated praise of the freedom of the press in England, Cazin published his books under the heading of London, or La Haye, Amsterdam, Genève, Venise, although they were invariably printed in France and Geneva.

The second striking particularity of the present edition is revealed in the introductory "Épître dédicatoire" by Pierre Alexandre Léorier-Delisle, the manufacturer of the paper marking this edition. The dedication is addressed to the French inventor Charles Louis Marquis Ducrest, better known as the brother of the "bel esprit" Mme de Genlis, who visited Voltaire at Ferney as an enthusiastic admirer of the patriarch, but vituperated her former idol under the Restoration. Léorier-Delisle, after previous experiments devoted to the production of paper from rags, grass and silk,

¹ Georges Bengesco, *Voltaire, Bibliographie de ses œuvres*. Ed Rouveyre & G. Blond, and Perrin, Paris, 1882-1889, III, 202-203, I, 250 et seq. The "Épîtres" are printed in the *Œuvres*, éd. Moland, X, 454-458. The letters are published *ibid.*, XLIII-XLV and I.

² J.-M. Quérard, *La France littéraire, ou Dictionnaire bibliographique*. Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1839, X, 207-208.

³ Quérard also records two editions of which I was unable to find any mention in Bengesco's work: *Œuvres du Marquis de Villette*, Londres, et Paris, Clousier, 1784, in-12, 270 pages, and *Œuvres du chevalier de Boufflers et du marquis de Villette*, Londres (Paris), 1782, in-18. The latter contain, according to Quérard, several unpublished letters of Voltaire. More detailed information on the editions of Villette's works is given in Jean Stern, *Belle et Bonne, Une Fervente Amie de Voltaire (1757-1822)*. Hachette, 1938, p. 219, appendix VI.

announces in the "Epître dédicatoire" that he has finally found hitherto useless vegetables which could be turned to paper and would thus be able to remedy the plight of the French paper manufactures. Accordingly, the 156 pages of the present volume are made of the bark of the yew-tree, and 20 additional sample pages are fabricated from the following vegetables lime-tree stinging-nettle, hop, moss, reed, hairweed, osier, willow, elm, oak, dog-grass, spindle-tree, hazel-tree, burdock, coltsfoot, thistle, dandelion and poplar.

Viewed in the light of Voltaire's profound interest in the art of printing, this landmark in the history of French books assumes particular importance. His bitter experiences with Duchesne, Lambert, Ledet, Pampie, Prault père and Prieur, the sight of "Œdipe," "Brutus," "Zulime," "Oreste," "Olympie" mutilated by "les omissions, les interpolations mal placées, les fautes de calcul, les noms défigurés, les fausses dates,"⁴ full of those "contresens intelligibles,"⁵ and a careful study of the evolution of printing throughout the preceding centuries had convinced him that artistic printers had nearly become extinct in his day.⁶ He deplored that the miserable editions released by French publishers "font dire aux étrangers que l'imprimerie tombe en France avec la littérature"⁷ Moreover, "La Guerre civile de Genève"⁸ and the "Essais sur les mœurs et l'esprit des nations"⁹ clearly reflect his marked interest in the manufacture of paper. Once he told Gabriel Cramer that the heavy taxes on paper were chiefly responsible for the sad condition of French typography¹⁰ In view of this, it is safe to assume that Voltaire, had he but lived another few years, would have been greatly pleased with this 1786 edition, remarkable as to get-up, printing and paper. The rarity of this precious book is undoubtedly the cause of its omission in the bibliography of Voltaire.¹¹

HENRY H. REMAK

Indiana University

⁴ *Œuvres de Voltaire*, éd. Moland, xxxviii, 156

⁵ *Ibid.*, xxxvi, 118

⁶ *Ibid.*, x, 415. See also xxxvi, 312, xlv, 127, xlv, 543 and xlv, 226

⁷ *Ibid.*, xxxvi, 119

⁸ *Ibid.*, xi, 171, and xii, 54

⁹ *Ibid.*, ix, 545

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, xlvii, 517.

¹¹ I wish to thank Prof. Norman L. Torrey of Columbia University, Prof. George R. Havens of The Ohio State University and Prof. Ira Wade of Princeton University for their helpful suggestions in relation to this article

FAIGUET, RÉFORMATEUR DE L'ORTHOGRAPHE

Les idées de l'économiste Joachim Faiguet de Villeneuve ¹ (1703-1780) sur la réforme de l'orthographe ont passé presque inaperçues chez les historiens de ce sujet qui a tellement intrigué les esprits curieux du dix-huitième siècle. Faiguet ne figure pas dans l'étude, d'ailleurs très étendue, de Didot, ² dans Brunot ³ une dizaine de lignes lui sont consacrées, mais son système phonétique (ou ce qui passait pour tel) n'y paraît pas, et le titre de son ouvrage principal est cité inexactement (il s'agit de *L'Econome politique*, non de *L'Economie politique*)

Dans les plus ambitieuses de ses œuvres—entre autres le *Mémoire pour la suppression des festes* (s. l., vers 1750), *L'Econome politique, projet pour enrichir et perfectionner l'espèce humaine* (Londres et Paris, 1763) et *L'Ami des pauvres* (Paris, 1766) — Faiguet énonça des idées sur l'économie politique qui, loin de faire école, furent même ridiculisées, ⁴ et c'est dans ces trois ouvrages—surtout dans les deux derniers—qu'il introduit ses réflexions sur l'orthographe. Sans prétention, et gouverné par la modération et le bon sens, il éclaircit ainsi dans la préface de *L'Econome politique* le système d'orthographe qu'il emploiera dans le corps de l'ouvrage.

on y remarquera quelques licences de nouvelle orthographe, que bien des gens n'approuveront peut être pas. Sur cela, comme sur autre chose, nous les laisserons dans leur opinion sans nous en inquiéter. Nous avons préféré, à l'exemple de nos célèbres Modernes, une manière d'orthographier plus

¹ Faiguet fut d'abord maître de pension et marchand de cochons, puis littérateur, il écrivit pour l'*Encyclopédie* (et non l'*Encyclopédie méthodique*, comme disent certaines biographies) les articles Citation, Dimanche, Epargne et Etudes, lesquels "ont été remarqués parmi les bons" selon la *Correspondance de Grimm* (Paris, Garnier, 1878, v, 298). Il publia aussi des essais et des poèmes dans le *Mercure* et dans d'autres journaux.

² A.-F. Didot, *Observations sur l'orthographe française*, Paris, 1867.

³ *Histoire de la langue française*, Paris, 1932, vi, 2^{me} partie, 951.

⁴ Dans la *Correspondance de Grimm* (vii, 97, année 1766) Faiguet fut qualifié de "bon et insipide rêveur de bien public," et plus tard de "pauvre diable de la classe de ces philosophes spéculatifs, dont le nombre s'est si prodigieusement accru depuis vingt ans" (viii, 312, année 1796). La *Biographie universelle* (éd. Michaud, Paris, 1815, xiv, 101) rapporte que "les différents ouvrages qu'il a publiés, intéressants par le sujet, mais rédigés avec trop peu de méthode et de soin, n'eurent que peu de succès lors de leur publication, et sont depuis longtemps oubliés."

conséquente et plus analogue aux sons que n'est l'orthographe ordinaire. Celle-ci, toute hérissée de caractères et de signes inutiles, embarrasse la plupart des Lecteurs, surtout les Étrangers amateurs de notre Langue. On nous y laisse de vieilles traces d'une Prononciation qui n'est plus d'usage, de même que de prétendues indications d'Étymologie qui n'éclairent ni les Savans ni les Ignorans. Ce sont là des observances futiles et mal entendues, ou pour parler plus juste, ce sont des superstitions Littéraires que notre siècle doit proscrire. On espère donc que les Gens Raisonables nous passeront le peu de licences que nous avons prises, d'autant mieux que nous n'avons rien négligé à d'autres égards pour donner une Édition des plus nettes et des plus exactes.

Quelques mots tirés de son texte démontrent combien son procédé est simple et lucide.

boneur	peis (pays)	chédeuvres
lontems	tionfera	condanant
pié (pied)	filosofie	décendants
fame (femme)	egar (égard)	baucoup
home	garsons	anees (années)
se marira (mariera)	u (eu)	dailleurs
quatrevint-seize	poura	aujourdui
soissante-set	se metre	meurs (mœurs)
péyee (payée)	dabor	come vous le voudriés

L'édition de 1766, portant le nouveau titre de *l'Ami des pauvres, ou l'Econome politique*, est suivie de *Deux Mémoires intéressans sur les maîtrises et sur les fêtes*, dans lesquels Fauguet essaie un système d'écriture phonétique. L'utilité de ses caractères, tout ingénieux qu'ils sont, est fort douteuse, il faut convenir que cette invention aurait donné à la langue française, comme dit la *Correspondance de Grimm*,⁵ "un air esclavon." Cependant ses caractères sont de beaucoup plus simples, ses mots plus compréhensibles que ceux de certains autres amateurs de phonétique, on reconnaît à peine, par exemple, les mots *ôtûs*, *dîze*, *muhe*, *grhe*, *sézûr*, qui, chez Restif de la Bretonne, représentent *honteux*, *digne*, *mourille*, *grille* et *seigneur*.

Voici comment Fauguet explique les nouveaux caractères d'impression qu'il emploie dans ses 70 dernières pages :

æ	se met pour ai, ay, ainsi <i>mætre</i> pour <i>maître</i> , <i>væ</i> pour <i>vray</i>
œ	se met pour oi, ainsi <i>mœteur</i> pour <i>morteur</i> , <i>lœ</i> pour <i>loi</i>
l	se met pour ch, ainsi <i>l'eval</i> pour <i>cheval</i> , <i>mouïe</i> pour <i>mouche</i>
u	se met pour gn; ainsi <i>campauue</i> pour <i>campagne</i>
â	se met pour ill; ainsi <i>bouaon</i> pour <i>bouillon</i> , <i>paæ</i> pour <i>paille</i>
k	se met pour qu, ainsi <i>ke</i> , <i>ki</i> pour <i>que</i> , <i>qui</i> , <i>preske</i> pour <i>presque</i>
ʀ	se met pour y, ainsi <i>roʀaume</i> pour <i>royaume</i> .

⁵ VII, 97 (année 1766).

A l'égard du *p* & du *b*, pour peu qu'on ait étudié les sons de notre langue, on sait que c'est presque le même son, que le son *p* ne diffère du son *b* qu'en ce que le premier est plus fort que le second, ainsi pour désigner ces sons si analogues, nous employons le même caractère, je veux dire le π grec, qui n'a ni queue ni tête, de sorte que nous le mettons dans sa position naturelle pour remplacer notre *p*, & que nous le renversons pour remplacer notre *b*, & cela uniquement pour avoir des caractères compris entre deux parallèles ainsi nous mettons *pas* pour *pas*, *was* pour *bas*, *paraxole* pour *parabole*

EDWARD D SEEBER

Indiana University

SOME LINGUISTIC STUDIES OF 1937 AND 1938¹

Two more volumes of the English Place-Name Society have come out during the period covered by this survey² Both volumes are sound pieces of work, and advance greatly our knowledge of the place-names of the counties treated. The following comments have to do with various matters of detail. The many Old-Icelandic forms given in Dr Smith's volume are nearly always referred to as OScand (Old Scandinavian), thus, on pp 4, 19, 27, 29, 35, 38, 41 etc. The propriety of giving these forms is not in question, but since they are actually classical Icelandic of the 13th and 14th centuries, it seems a bit misleading to call them Old Scandinavian, a term which in ordinary scientific usage means something quite different. Since the hypothetical OE *gips* (p 5) must in any case get its initial [g] from the Scandinavian, and since no related English forms in [ps] or [sp] are adduced, it would seem only reasonable to derive the hypothetical word as a whole from the Scandinavian. It would be enlightening to know why [p] developed in *Patrington* (p. 25) but not in *Ottringham* (p 31). On *Withernsea* (p 26) and *Withernwick* (p. 69), see E Ekwall, *SNPh* x 113 ff. There seems no good reason for calling the *b* of *Camberwell* (p. 55) euphonic. A word on the dissimilation [pf > tf] in *Hatfield* (p. 63) would be in place. The *n* of *Houndale* (p 94) is to be derived from earlier *l* by dissimilation, all reference to a by-form *Holmr* should be deleted. Some explanation should be given of the alternative pronunciations of the second element of *Wansford* (p 95). Words in *-ing* should not be called patronymics

¹ This survey is limited to books sent to *MLN* for review

² xiv, *The Place-Names of the East Riding of Yorkshire and York*, by A H Smith, pp lx, 351, xv, *The Place-Names of Hertfordshire*, by J E B Gover, Allen Mawer and F M Stenton, pp xlv, 342, Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, The Macmillan Co \$6 (18s) each.

(p. 100) unless they are actually so. The name *Múla*, though called OEScand (p. 125), has a classical Icelandic look. I see no reason to reject the DB form *Colnun* (p. 126), we have here a dat pl with suffixed article, equivalent to Icel *kollunum*. The change [s > þ] in *Thuxendale* (p. 133) may have developed out of a lispng pronunciation of the [s], or it may have been a case of dissimilation. On *Acklam* (p. 147) see E. Ekwall, *SNPh* x 107 ff. The term "early English" (p. 190) in the sense "early modern English" is unhappy. The first pronunciation given for *Thearne* (p. 201) is puzzling. The *y* of *yrcebiscep* (p. 233) is hardly to be explained as an inverted spelling, it is more likely a genuine West-Saxonism. *Gunne* (p. 239) and *Jóke* (p. 256) are not "reduced" forms but hypocoristic forms. The first element of *Gribthorpe* (p. 240) may be OE *gripu* 'caldron' (for another possibility, see *NED* under *grip* sb²). *Huvuþ* (p. 251) may be Norwegian, see A. Noreen, *Altisl Gram*, 4th ed., p. 107. A reference to the OIcel record of *Skornur* (p. 273) would be desirable. The term *lenation* (p. 279) is objectionable, the correct linguistic form is *lenition*, duly used elsewhere in the volume. I note a misprint on p. 292, line 4.

In the volume on Hertfordshire, the reference to the "continental Anglo-Saxons" (p. xiv) is unfortunate, since we have no right to presume that the Angles and Saxons made one people on the Continent. The spelling *debateable* (p. xvi) is deplorable. Is *Stortford* really pronounced [staːsfəd], as we are told on p. xxv? The AN substitution of [ð] for the English palatal voiced spirant seems to me quite natural, and by no means an "eccentricity" (p. 15). *Frogmore* (p. 23) is hardly so corrupt a form as the authors think. Unluckily the connecting links between *Fognam* and *Fogmer* have not come down to us, but since the name is often coupled with *field* we may safely presume that *Fognam fel(d)* might have been pronounced as **Fognamvel* or, with assimilation, **Fogmel*. Such a form, coupled once more with *field*, might then, by dissimilation, become *Fogmer*, whence the later *Fogmore*. The current *Frogmore* owes its first *r* to contamination with the other *Frogmores* of the county. The brilliant etymology of *Tring* (p. 25) cannot be accepted, because of the initial [t]. If we take OE *bufan* in the sense 'from above,' the etymology of *Bovingdon* (p. 29) becomes clearer. The [t] of *Caddington* (p. 30) wants explanation, we have here a case of dissimilation [d d > d. t]. The *n*-infix in *Harpenden* and the like (pp. 38, 92, 171, 205) ought not to be discussed without reference to cases like *nightingale* and *messenger*, whatever the chronology. It would seem that a tendency

existed to insert [n] in a weak penult before a stop or affricate of the ultima. If penult as well as ultima began with a stop, this seemed to facilitate the insertion. *Organ* (p. 61) is better taken in the sense 'hurdy-gurdy'. If an OE *rādgelēte* existed, it did not mean 'junction of roads' (p. 61). *Tibberstreet* became *Tibbolstreet* by dissimilation (p. 62), confusion with *Theobald* followed, but had nothing to do with the rise of the dissimulated form. I doubt the soundness of the description of the *sh* of *Shoppesle* as "eccentric" (p. 96), very possibly *sh* meant the same as *s* to this speller, in which case the *s* is quite as it should be and the eccentricity is confined to the *h*. It is hard to see how *Wiggen* (from *Wiðgen*) with its stop [g] can be got from OE **wiþegn* (p. 107). Phonologically the form is derivable from OE *wiðgæn*, pp. 'with-gone' i. e. 'withdrawn' or the like. A withdrawn nook might mean simply a remote, out-of-the-way place. The change of *Pulver mead* to *Pulmer mead* (p. 110) need not have come about by popular etymology, we may have here a case of what the Germans call *fernassimilation*. The derivation of *Ayot* from OE *Æga* plus *geat* (p. 119) seems unlikely, since the genitival *n* is wanting. I venture the suggestion that *Ayot* may come from *eagegeat* 'eye-gap.' One does not think of Baghdad as an Arabian city (p. 120). It is by no means clear (p. 123) that "the scribe got confused between final *t* and initial *d*" in writing *Tæccungawyrðe*, the initial *t* may be perfectly genuine, the original *d* having been assimilated to the *t* of the preceding *æt*. The explanation given for *Digswell* (p. 124) seems to me unsound. No forms in *n* appear before the 13th century, whereas forms in *l* are recorded for the 11th and 12th centuries. We must therefore proceed on the assumption that the *l*-forms are the original ones. From these the nasal forms can be derived by dissimilation. The form *Digswell* itself, which has neither *l* nor *n* in its first member, is derivable from the *l*-form by dissimilation, in this case the *l* was dropped instead of being turned into an *n*. The alternation *Suening* / *Swaning* (p. 131) indicates the presence in OE of forms with and without *i*-mutation side by side, confusion with Scandinavian *Sveinn* is not indicated by this alternation. The *t* of *Haultwrick* is perhaps not so irregular (p. 135) after all, certainly the change [ld > lt] is not infrequent in English, witness the dialectal *holt* for *hold*, and such familiar forms as *split*. The *bb* forms of *Crowbury* (p. 143) show assimilation *wb* > *bb*. *Weston* (p. 146) is perhaps better explained as 'abandoned or deserted farm'. The form *Horeswell* (p. 160), added to the difficulty about the *d*, makes unlikely the etymology offered by Ekwall. Derivation from OE *horg* seems more plausible. The *d*

of DB is presumably [ð] and may be interpreted as an Anglo-Norman substitute for the spirant *g* of the English form *Wardington* may be got from the older *Waterdon* (p 174) by metathesis (t d > d .t) and assimilation (r > n), the *r* of the current form is only a spelling, to mark the preceding vowel as [ɔ] The Ptolemaic tribal name *Chaidemon* (which must be connected with OE *hæp*) indicates that the *d* of *Hadham* (p 176) may be original. *Mentley* (p 197) is a beautiful example of dissimilation The first element of *Essendon* (p 223) is *Esa*, in spite of the KCD form The man might be called either *Esa* (true name) or *Esla* (diminutive of *Esa*, used as pet name) I have noted a misprint on p 8, line 5

Rolf Kaiser has made a painstaking and useful study of the geographical distribution in ME of words not used throughout English-speaking territory.³ His book falls into four parts I, comparison of texts extant in northern and southern versions (here *Cursor Mundi* gives the bulk of the evidence); II, study of certain texts safely localized and dated, III, study of texts the localization of which is doubtful, and IV, alphabetical list (1) of northern words and (2) of southern words, with exact references to their places of occurrence in the monuments studied. The author has gone through an astonishing number of texts (listed on pp 292-307), on the other hand, he has made practically no use of the place-name material, though not unaware of its importance for an investigation of this kind (see p. 165 footnote). He tells us in his preface that *er sich durchaus bewusst ist, nur einen bescheidenen Anfang geleistet zu haben*, and expresses the hope that his work may prove a useful basis for further studies in the geographical distribution of the English vocabulary Of particular interest is his localization of the Gawain poet in Westmorland or southern Cumberland (p 168). The author has found few words restricted to the south, his explanation of this peculiarity (p 114) does not take into account the linguistic prestige which the south enjoyed He holds to the old view that the *Prücke* is by Rolle, though aware (p 117) that Rolle's authorship is no longer generally believed in. His statement that the romanian element of the English vocabulary *durch seinen Wortakzent jede stehende Dichtung storen und vernichten musste* (p 168) holds good only to a limited degree, in particular, many words taken from French had main or secondary stress on the first syllable, or soon gained initial stress in English

³ *Zur Geographie des me Wortschatzes*, von Rolf Kaiser, Leipzig, Mayer & Müller, 1937, pp x, 318, map

Herbert Koziol's handbook⁴ is a superior piece of work. It is well ordered and well written, and shows a good command of the material. The following notes may prove of use for the next edition. It is hardly right to link monosyllabism so closely to the Germanic parts of the vocabulary (p. 10), many words of French origin are monosyllabic, as *ease*, *please*, *aim* etc. As a taker of words from foreign languages, and particularly from Latin (pp. 10 f., 14), English has outdone German but hardly French, and not a few languages (as Finnish, Welsh, Turkish) have gone even further than English in the matter of borrowing words. In my childhood the railway train went choo-choo rather than puff-puff (p. 23). For a different view of the so-called imperative formations (p. 57), see O. Behaghel, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* xxv 133 f. *Barton* means 'farm-yard' not 'Scheune' (p. 63), and OE *bere* meant 'barley' not 'Weizen' (pp. 63 f.). The form *ill-supported* (p. 69) is misplaced. OE *þærwip* (p. 76) still lives, as *therewith*. The word *anent* (p. 77) is also still in use. A few words seem to have dropped out on p. 140 (fourth line from bottom). The suffixes *-t* and *-ock* (p. 143) are not properly classified as diminutives, see F. A. Wood, *Some Parallel Formations in English* (Hesperia Ergänzungsreihe, vol. 1). Is *gurleen* (p. 148) a slip for *colleen*? The author seems to imply (p. 151) that *clothier* is obsolete; if so, he is mistaken. The author should have pointed out (p. 157) that the feminine suffix *-ess* is on the decline; we no longer say *teacheress*, for example, but prefer to say *woman teacher* on the few occasions where we feel it needful to bring in the matter of sex. In connexion with the suffix *-al* (p. 164) or elsewhere, the author should have mentioned *burial* and *bridal*, in which the *-al* (contrast *riddle*) is felt to be suffixal. *Foursome* and the like are not now dialectal (p. 185), though they may have been once upon a time. The author seems to have overlooked (p. 191) K. Uhler's dissertation on OE *-lice*; in it Uhler proves that the adverbial function of this suffix goes back to OE times. The etymology given for *beg* and *beggar* (p. 195) is wrong, as is shown by the fact that the early spelling was regularly *begger*. Under the head "Aufspaltung" (pp. 199 f.) should be included cases like *gate* / *gait*, and *ture* / *tyre*, where differences in spelling were seized upon to make two words out of one. The spelling *maise* for the short form of *master* (p. 224) might have been mentioned. The explanation given for *nugget* (p. 231) is not acceptable, the NED derives the word from a dialectal *nug*. Alongside *tawdry* and the

⁴ *Handbuch der engl. Wortbildungslehre*, von H. Koziol; Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1937, pp. xvi, 260, RM 9.

like (p 231) might have been included examples of proper names, as *Ned* from *mine Ed.* The author should have made much more of *tabu*, which he mentions as an afterthought, it would seem (p 242) To the list of misprints (p. 244), add *greveling* (p 190)

Miss M. M. Roseborough's *Outline of Middle English Grammar*⁵ is devoted chiefly to phonology, the inflexions are covered in 20 pages, and only three pages are given to syntax. The book is intended for the beginner It is primarily historical rather than descriptive, and presupposes a working knowledge of Old English Much attention is rightly given to the differences between the ME dialects, and the attempt is made to explain these differences historically Unluckily the author often falls into careless statements apt to mislead the unwary, and the book cannot be called a safe one for beginners unless a competent teacher is at hand to supply the needful qualifications and corrections Thus, from the discussion of orthography (p 2) an uninitiated person would naturally conclude that the OE letter þ was not used in ME, and we are told in so many words (p 4) that *qu* for OE *cw* is a "sign-post" for the Northern dialect. On p 13 the author says (rightly enough) that scholars disagree as to whether the ME spelling *e* for OE long *æ* has any phonetic significance, but on p 15 we learn that "it is generally agreed that long and short *æ* underwent phonetic change in ME." These two statements are perhaps reconcilable, but on the face of it they do not agree, and the student may well be puzzled. The use of the term "double consonants" for consonant groups like *st* (p 9) is unorthodox, though it will not lead the student seriously astray Many other passages, more or less unhappy, might be quoted, but I see no need of laboring the point The author makes no mention of either Luick or Jordan Karl Brunner's *Abriss*⁶ is also a book meant for beginners, but the author uses his equally limited space to better advantage than does Miss Roseborough Indeed, Brunner gives us as full and clear a presentation of ME grammar as we could hope for in such narrow room. He skilfully combines morphology and syntax under the head, "Flexionsformen und ihre Verwendung" (this section makes up about half the book) The work as a whole is a masterpiece of accurate condensation His picture of the neglect of English for literary purposes after 1066 is a somewhat exaggerated one (p 1), and the implication (*ibid*) that the OE orthographical tradition died out is contradicted by his later discussion of the spelling sys-

⁵ Macmillan, New York, 1938, pp x, 112, map, chart, \$2

⁶ *Abriss der mittelenenglischen Grammatik*, Niemeyer, Halle, 1938, pp 90, RM 2.40.

tem (pp 3 f) I am highly sceptical about the hypothetical Anglo-Norman copyists of English manuscripts (p 5), the English themselves, I fear, must take the blame for their own inconsistencies and mistakes in spelling, except for legal documents like the Domesday Book and a few other exceptional pieces of writing. On p 19, the words *im Silbenanlaut* should be deleted, and the brackets should be removed from the words following. On p. 59 the author fails to mention *erst* (OE *ærest*) in his discussion of the ordinals.

A S C Ross has done a careful and important study of the OE glosses in the so-called Durham Book.⁷ His method of attack is particularly to be commended, and his results have significance in many branches of OE studies. The following details seem worthy of more or less critical comment. The term *Avestic* (p. 13 and elsewhere) seems needless, since the language already has *Avestan* in the same sense. Why not *Walde-Pokorny* (p 15 and elsewhere)? The author's explanation of the *e* of *sune* (p 52) is not convincing, and his conclusion (p 53) that the scribe himself used only a palatal variety of the weak vowel must be rejected as not borne out by the evidence. The reference to Luick (p 54) gives a false impression. That authority derived the *a* of *herepap* and the like from an earlier *o*, and he conceived this *o* to have arisen in weak syllables under the influence of labial consonants. This obviously has no bearing on the gen. sg. ending *-as* for regular *-es*, unless the *-as* can be associated with bases ending in a labial consonant. Luick also mentions the particles *ac*, *at*, the *a* of which he also derives from an earlier *o*, in these words the round vowel may have arisen under the influence of nasals or labials of neighboring words in sentence combinations. Ross's explanation of the *-as* ending is fundamentally different from all this, and one is puzzled at the citation of Luick. The *-as* is better explained as derived from the earlier *-es*, in the scribe's pronunciation the weak vowel had a darker color before final *s*, and he sometimes departed from traditional orthography to indicate this color, using (properly enough) an *a* for the purpose. Alternatively, we may avoid speculation about the color of the scribe's weak vowel by supposing that the gen. sg. *-es* and the nom. acc. pl. *-as* had been leveled in the scribe's pronunciation, and that in consequence he sometimes used for the gen. sg. the spelling traditionally associated with the nom. acc. pl. The analogy discussed on p 56 appears also in Gothic u-stems (in

⁷ *Studies in the Accidence of the Lindisfarne Gospels*, Leeds School of English Language Texts and Monographs, No II, Leeds, 1937, pp 179, 10 sh

i-stems it worked the other way) On p. 58, line 14, read *in* for *ii*. The *his* surely marks *edo* (p 60) as sing. The *o* may be due to influence from the *in*-stems, such a word as *mengo* 'crowd' might well be associated with a fem group-name like *eowd* 'flock, herd' and give it -*o* for a sing. ending If Icel *róða* is from English, its weak inflexion supports the author's argument (p 68) The discussion on p. 73 seems confused The variation *ðy* / *ðnu* nom. sg fem is parallel to *þy* / *ðvo* instr sg, similarly *ðys* / *ðvus* nom sg fem and *ðys* / *ðvos* instr sg. (pp 115 ff) I conceive that the phonetic alternation became familiar first in the instr and then was extended to the nom. sg fem If *fræгна* is a strong verb (pp 131 f), it belongs presumably to the sixth class (with nasal present, like *standan*). Ross might have cited as a parallel the North German *fragen*, pret *frug* (presumably Low German in origin), although here the nasal has been leveled out of the present, certainly it cannot be said that this verb has been "hitherto unknown" The postulated PrGmc form is obscure to me

Two of the tracts of the Society for Pure English will next be considered^{*} No XLVIII is made up of three short papers Linguistic Self-Criticism, by Otto Jespersen, Terminology in Physics, by C G Darwin, and The Irregularities of English, by Sir W. A. Craigie. The first of these is a penetrating as well as agreeable discussion of what Jespersen calls speakers' asides, i e. interruptions in the flow of words, breaks made in order to set forth the speaker's attitude toward what he is saying e g. *truth to tell*, *strictly speaking*, etc Darwin's paper, reprinted from the 138th volume of *Nature*, is likewise of some interest, it deals with the problem of devising suitable technical terms in physics, and makes a few suggestions which, if adopted, will surely help Sir William's paper on irregularities, however, is so slight that one wonders why it was printed It reveals, to be sure, a pre-scientific philosophy of language hardly to be expected of the foremost of living lexicographers, but the disillusionment is one that we might have been spared Tract No. I, by Sir William Craigie, is a pleasant essay, informative to the layman, on Northern words in Modern English. By northern the author means not only north-country and Scottish English but also Scandinavian He discusses a number of words taken into standard speech from northern sources during modern times. I will comment on one detail only *Virginian Reel* (p 353) should be *Virguma reel*, Sir William's long stay in the United States was evidently not long enough.

^{*} XLVIII and I, Oxford Univ Press, New York, 1937, pp 269-291 and 327-362, 85 cents each

H. A. Treble and G. H. Vallins have given us, in dictionary form,⁹ a work more condensed than H. W. Fowler's *Modern English Usage* but written under the influence of that brilliant and vicious book. The *ABC* is handy to use, and has much good in it, but belongs essentially to the pre-scientific age. The authors, like Fowler, have caught little of the spirit and the point of view of modern linguistic scholarship. Their respect for facts is hardly greater than that of the 18th century grammarians who sought to make English over on the Latin model. The term *usage* in their title means, not actual usage as determined by scientific investigation, but the linguistic prejudices of the authors, prejudices which on some points are so strong as to deprive them of their linguistic birthright, namely, their feeling for the language. Strange as it may seem, the authors actually recommend *Whom were you speaking to?* They admit that *Who were you speaking to?* is "so common as to be almost ['!'] idiomatic." But, they say, "the fact remains that *to*, though far removed, does still govern the interrogative pronoun in the accusative; and 'Whom were you speaking to?' should always be the version in writing" (p. 148). This is truly prescriptive rather than descriptive grammar. The authors ignore the facts of usage when these facts disagree with their preconceived ideas. In other words, their procedure is thoroughly unscientific and anti-intellectual. In this, unluckily, they are only typical, the book market swarms with grammars and rhetorics written on the same principles.

The two dictionaries which we will next consider¹⁰ both have merit. Partridge, well known already for his many publications in the field of shady speech, here brings his collections together in a volume of impressive proportions. I have been unable to examine every entry in this 1000-page work, but I have gone through many pages, and find the work deserving of confidence, so far as the facts are concerned, though naturally slips sometimes occur, as when the author speaks of "the omission of the relative *that*," which "is recorded as early as C. 13" (p. 873), the implication being that the construction arose at that time, but see Curme *Syntax* pp. 233 ff. (asyndetic relative construction). Under *britches* (p. 94) this spelling of *breeches* is explained as a result of "careless pronunciation," whereas it actually does no more than give written

⁹ *An ABC of English Usage*, Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1937; pp. 195, \$1.50.

¹⁰ *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*, by Eric Partridge, Macmillan, New York, 1937, pp. xvi, 999, \$12.50. *A Mark Twain Learnon*, by R. L. Ramsay and F. G. Emberson; Univ. of Missouri Studies XIII, 1 (Jan., 1938), pp. cxx, 278, \$1.25.

expression to the regular pronunciation (surely Partridge does not pronounce *breeches* with a long *e*) But here we enter a different province the author's facts are usually right but his explanations are often bad—sometimes even absurd, as in the present case An amazing etymology is the derivation of *filly* 'girl' from French *filie* (p. 275), instead of from *filly* 'young mare.' The derivation of *fanny* from the name of Cleland's heroine (p. 266) has a certain plausibility, but why did Cleland call her Fanny? I derive both *Fanny* and *fanny* from the earlier *fancy*, used in 1657 by Thornley in the Epistle Dedicatory of his translation of *Daphnis and Chloe*, but ignored by the lexicographers (including Partridge) Under *bugger* (p. 103) the author remarks, quite gratuitously and in all likelihood slanderously, "the Albigenian heretics were often perverts" Such observations have no place in a work of this kind (if indeed anywhere) The word *bugger* is here spelt out, but elsewhere it may appear as *b****r*, such exhibitions of prudery are not only inconsistent but foolish, and unworthy of the author The derivation of *kaput* in the phrase *finex kaput* (p. 276) would have given the author less trouble if he had consulted a German dictionary, it is a familiar German word, derived, indeed, from the term *capot* in the game of piquet, but with a subsequent history and meaning of its own. *Folks* (better, *just folks*) in the U S means, not 'respectable people' (p. 294) but plain, ordinary, everyday people The dictionary would be more valuable if it included more Americanisms, but the author takes into account only such American words as have become established in British usage The Ramsay-Embeison lexicon grew out of an elaborate study of Mark Twain's vocabulary which for many years has been in progress at the University of Missouri under Professor Ramsay's competent direction The book makes no attempt to give all the words that Mark Twain used. The words selected for inclusion, 7802 in number, were chosen, as the authors tell us, "with four aims in mind We have tried to collect all of his Americanisms, . . . all of his new words, formations, and usages, . . . all of his archaisms, . . . Finally, we have included . . . certain miscellaneous groups of words which seemed to be significant or interesting for various reasons" The lexicon proper is preceded by an elaborate analysis of Mark Twain's vocabulary, a monograph in itself The analysis ends with a list of "problem words" (p. cxii), to which the authors invite the special attention of those who may be interested in finding solutions. In most cases the authors themselves have solved the problem admirably, but a few words call for more or less comment. The poker terms *deuces-and* and *kings-and* illustrate the use of

and in final position, the authors rightly cite as a parallel the *ham and* (i e ham and eggs) of American lunch-rooms and restaurants. But *and* may occur finally, not only in words and phrases but also in sentences, witness the following. "This is the window he stood between me and." The derivation of *biggity* from *big-head-y* is surely right, but needs a phonetic footnote. unstressed intervocalic *d* and *t* in American speech are hard to distinguish, and once *head* lost its stress in the combination *big-head-y* it might well become *-it-*. *Dusty Christian* 'worthless, vile Christian' may refer to the humility of the mourners' bench, a state of mind which Mark Twain could not bring himself to. The authors' comment on *liked to* (p 135) implies that *liked* is pronounced with a [d] in some forms of English, but surely Mark Twain, who heard "no -d in actual *colloq.* Am pronunciation," would have heard none wherever he went. I cannot agree with the authors on their interpretation of the apostrophe in *Miss' Sally*. The preceding passage, where *Missus* is used, indicates that the apostrophe marks the omission of the *-us*. Certainly *Miss'* cannot be for *Miz*, which would never be used with a Christian name, whether the lady were married or single. The derivation of *sny* from French *chenal* seems correct, but makes phonetic difficulties. Could a palatal *l* have been used in this word? A variant *chenail* would become *sny* much more readily than the regular form *chenal*. The emendation of *white-sleeve* to *white-slave* which the authors suggest seems plausible. Further investigation should concern itself with Mark Twain's handwriting and with his proof-reading. Did he write *a* in such a way that it might be mistaken for *ee*? And did he read proof carefully or not? It ought to be possible to get reliable information on both these matters. The list of Mark Twain's "Indelicate terms and euphemisms" (p lvi) is amazingly short, and even this list is not fully supported in the lexicon proper by the examples quoted. Thus, it seems incredible that Mark Twain never once used *ass* in the sense 'arse,' yet the authors give no quotation for this sense. The expurgation of his published works must have been a thorough job indeed.

Hans-Oskar Wilde, now associated with Morsbach in the editorship of *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, has brought out, as vol. 94 of that series, an unusually interesting and important phonetic study¹¹. This is one of the few phonetic investigations in which the instrumental and acoustic methods are combined, and the combination has proved fruitful, though more questions are raised than

¹¹ *Der Industrie-Dialekt von Birmingham, Intonation und Sprachvariante*, Niemeyer, Halle, 1938, pp 88, RM 3.40

are answered. Of particular value for the non-instrumentalist is the reproduction, in phonetic notation, of two monologues by Graham Squiers in Birmingham dialect, the modified standard spelling which Squiers himself used does not present his hero's pronunciation with precision. Wilde in his investigation made use of the two monologues in two forms: a printed text and a gramophone record. By comparison of the two he was able to come to interesting conclusions about the spelling system which Squiers used, more especially, about the significance of certain spelling variants. Such variants, familiar in medieval manuscripts, are usually dismissed as without phonetic significance, but Sievers attached great importance to them in his later investigations. Wilde finds that the variations in spelling (e.g. *yo* and *yer* for *you*) in Squiers' printed text actually have phonetic significance, though a satisfactory phonetic interpretation was not always possible. Wilde's study of the intonation of the monologues revealed that the pitch-range of the stressed syllables was less than that of the unstressed syllables: the high pitches were higher, the low pitches lower, if the syllable was unstressed. For further *Ergebnisse* the reader is referred to the monograph itself. It must not be supposed, however, that Wilde has really solved any problems. On the contrary, his study serves chiefly to show us how little we know about linguistic phenomena. We have barely scratched the surface of our subject.

Oma Stanley in *The Speech of East Texas*¹² presents a competent analysis of the pronunciation of English current in eastern Texas. The work falls into four chapters, devoted respectively to stressed vowels, unstressed or weakly stressed vowels, consonants and illustrative texts. These chapters are followed by three appendices. Appendix A (seven pages) takes up "grammar" (i.e. morphology), Appendix B (two pages) is a list of sentences, duly transcribed, in illustration of low colloquial speech, Appendix C (13 pages) deals with the origins of the Texan population. The appendices, though not without interest, might have been dispensed with, or (in the case of C) taken care of in the introduction, but the body of the work gives us a careful, detailed, and accurate study, a credit to the author and to Columbia University, where it was submitted as a doctoral dissertation. It would be interesting to know whether the East Texans pronounce *real* (p. 7) and *reel* alike. The author says nothing of a long vowel in *yes* (p. 11), is the vowel of this word actually always short in East Texas?

¹² American Speech Reprints and Monographs, No. 2, Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1937, pp. x, 135; \$2.50.

Since a stop can be and often is held as long as a fricative, the term *continuants* for fricatives (p 23) is unscientific. I find it hard to believe that *no* in East Texas never has the pronunciation [no] or [nou], in spite of the author's silence on the point (p 24), what of such a sentence as *no relief yet from the heat*? The author was ill advised in using that monstrosity of a term *plosives* (p 55) instead of *stops*. It is hardly right to say that [j] was lost in *figured* (p 57), since the current [j] is probably due to spelling-pronunciation. The pret. pl *begun* (96) is an old form, not derivable from the past participle. I have noted a misprint on p 104.

Phil Karl Thielke has made a discriminating study of current slang,¹⁸ supported by many well-chosen examples from a variety of sources, he includes also a number of colloquialisms and cant terms. He divides his study into three parts. In the first, the material is classified according to its origin; in the second, according to its form, in the third, according to its meaning. The classes set up are well considered and useful, though not exhaustive. Since the material given is presented for purposes of illustration only, one can hardly blame the author for leaving out this or that, but the list of takings from German is so short that one wonders at the omission of *dumb* 'stupid' and *burg* 'town' (p. 50). *Mug up* and *mug away* (p 19) differ in that the former is perfective, the latter imperfective. Partridge marks *smug* sb. 3 (p. 20) obsolescent, and the author ought to have recorded this mark with the rest of the quotation. *Pal* and *chum* (p. 31) differ considerably in their associations. *Wangle* (p. 45) is best defined as 'obtain by diplomacy or artifice' (Wyld, *Universal Dict*). *Lark* (p 47) is wrongly derived from OE *lác*, it actually comes from the name of the bird. *Peaky* (p 48) may also take the form *peaked* (disyllabic). *Mugwump* (p. 51) is inadequately defined. *Bat an eyelid* (p. 53) is used only in the negative. *Come off it* (p 55) implies coming down from a platform, a pedestal or some other high and mighty spot and facing the facts. *Crack* (p. 55) is probably an abbreviation of *wisecrack* (p. 62), and *nerts* (p. 58) is an arbitrary alteration of *nuts* 'crazy' (p. 177). *Stooge* (p. 61) is a fool rather than a fool; it is also used in the sense 'tool.' *Uplift* (p 61) is regularly used as a term of disparagement. *Making whoopee* (p. 62) is said of public or communal noisy fun, and 'enjoy oneself' is hardly an adequate gloss. *Sissy* (p 72) means 'effeminate man.'

¹⁸ *Slang und Umgangssprache in der englischen Prosa der Gegenwart*, Munsterer Anglistische Studien, Heft 4, H & J Lechte, Emsdetten, 1938, pp. 234, RM 6 75

The chapter on short forms (pp 75 ff) includes many rare or nonce-words hardly worth recording. *Raft* would go well with *oodles* and *skads* (p 116). *Dinky* (p 117) has a bad sense in America. The nonce word *papterino* (p 120) seems to be an altered form of *pippin* (p 121). The meanings given for *plant* and *sell* (p 132) do not agree with the illustrative quotations. *Sock* (p 138) means not so much 'a beating' as 'a blow'. *Dime* (p 142) is not slang but the official name of the coin. *Dog's dinner* (p 147) remains enigmatic in the absence of a reference to *doggy* 'stylish' and the like. *Nib* (p 153) is to be derived, with Wyld, from *nib* 'nose, face,' though I differ from Wyld in connecting it with the first rather than the second of the two meanings. A person who feels his importance is said to walk with his nose in the air, hence the figurative use of *nib* to mean a person of importance. *His nibs* and *her nibs* seem to be patterned on *His Royal Highness* or some such expression. A sound etymology of *filly* 'girl' (p 159) will be found in the *NED*. *Flabbergast* (p 181) is rarely if ever used except for the past participle, and the participial, not the infinitive form should be the one listed. *Bacon* as a mark of success (p 191) goes back to Chaucer at least. I have noted misprints on pp 1 (footnote), 104, 123, 151.

William Matthews describes his *Cockney Past and Present*¹⁴ as a "short history of the dialect of London." He might have added that it was written more for the general public than for the learned. As a popular presentation of the subject it has merit, and can be commended, though the proof-reading might have been better (e g on pp 7 f). But as a piece of research it must be called superficial, indeed, elementary mistakes are not wanting, e. g. the interpretation of *moe* and *mo* (pp 11, 23) as "phonetic spellings" of *more*, and various explanations of a like kind on p 22. Such errors indicate an imperfect knowledge both of phonetics and of the history of the language, faults which time and study will no doubt remedy, but which have left their mark on this book. The truth of the matter is that our academic system tends to force a young scholar into print too soon, and when he has a subject so attractive as is Cockney English the temptation to get out a book as soon as possible becomes the harder to resist. But the author had other motives. He wished to defend Cockney English against its traducers, and to convince the learned that here was a subject worthy of their attention. As he puts it (p. xiv),

The present book is an attempt to remedy some of the injuries of Cockney by tracing, so far as the available material will permit, the growth of the

¹⁴ Dutton, New York, 1938, pp. xvi, 245; \$2.65

vulgar speech of London from the sixteenth century until the present day

I shall feel amply satisfied if I merely succeed in correcting some popular errors concerning the dialect and in persuading English philologists that æsthetic and moral dislike of vulgar forms of speech are inadequate reasons for leaving them to be dealt with by foreigners

He has certainly succeeded, I should say, in reaching both these objectives, and his book ought to lead to further work in the field.

During the period covered by this survey, one more volume of the great Danish dictionary, and four more instalments of the lamented Schroer's English-German dictionary have appeared.¹⁵ Both these works maintain the high standard set at the beginning. A dictionary of another kind is *The English Duden*¹⁶ This work bears the sub-title "Picture Vocabularies in English." It contains some 30,000 words explained by pictures. The words are listed in the first or English index of 166 pages, where one finds the number of the plate on which the word is given pictorial explanation. A German index of 133 pages is also given, and the preface and introduction are bilingual. As far as it goes, the volume will serve as a German-English and (less conveniently) English-German dictionary. Opposite each plate the pictures on the plate are explained (in English), so that one can hardly go wrong. The authors have a good command of English, though now and then they make slips, they rarely take account of American usage. The table of contents is a list of the plates, arranged according to subject, and it is possible to use the book to good effect without referring to the index at all.

Otto Jespersen in his *Analytic Syntax*¹⁷ has worked out a system of symbols useful in sentence analysis. By substituting the appropriate symbols for the words or word-groups that make up the sentence, the syntactical structure may be brought out much as a chemical formula brings out the elements of a salt or acid. Thus, S stands for subject, V for verb, O for direct object, *O* for indirect object. In the teaching of syntax in the schools, such a system might be used instead of the diagrams once a regular part of grammatical drill. Some system of analysis is certainly desirable, not only for pedagogical reasons but also because of its scientific fruits. As Jespersen remarks (p. 15),

¹⁵ *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, xvii. Bind præst-ræeg, Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1937, pp. 748. *Englisches Handwörterbuch*, von M. M. A. Schroer, Lieferungen 2-5, Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1937-8, pp. 65-384, applaud-deploy, RM 2 25 each.

¹⁶ Adapted from Duden's *Bildwörterbuch* by H. Klien and M. Ridpath-Klien, G. E. Stechert & Co., New York, 1937, pp. xvi, 662, 166, 133; 342 plates plus 6 colored plates, \$2.40.

¹⁷ Allen & Unwin, London, 1937; pp. 170.

the elaboration of the present system has opened my eyes to the real character of many things even in the languages I was most familiar with

Much that we are apt to take for granted in everyday speech and consider as simple or unavoidable discloses itself on being translated into symbols as a rather involved logical process

The system which Jespersen has worked out has many advantages and deserves wide application and serious study. It is to be hoped that an outline of it will be included in future editions of his admirable schoolbook, *Essentials of English Grammar*, and that through its use syntactical study will become more meaningful to the student than it now is.

I will conclude this survey with a brief consideration of three books of a more general character.¹⁸ President Callahan's interesting volume falls into three parts. First, a general part, called "Language Studies," in which the author surveys his subject historically and philosophically, second, a syntactical part, called "Principles of Grammar," and third, a morphological part, called "Grammatical Etymology." Phonology is not taken up. The author seems not to be a professional linguist, and much of what he says would be challenged in professional circles, but his point of view and method of approach command respect, and he has something to contribute. Mr. Wilson gives to his book the sub-title, "Its [i. e. Language's] Place in World Evolution and its Structure in Relation to Space and Time," and in his preface he tells us that he has "attempted a philosophical exposition of language." Exceedingly little of the book is taken up with linguistics in the ordinary sense of that word, the author is concerned rather to relate the rise of language to the differentiation of man from the other animals. His main thesis may well be right, he certainly argues the case well, and he has produced a readable and stimulating book. Demonstration is impossible, however, at our present stage of development, whatever the theory about the origin of speech. In particular, the rise of man, and of language with him, was surely a much slower business than the author seems to think, and the first man hardly had that mastery of time and space which his offspring were to gain. The late Dr. Goldberg chose for his book a title bound to offend the linguist, and in his sub-title, "An Introduction to Language for Everyman," he announced in so many words that he was writing for non-professional readers. But we read in his introduction (p. viii) that "no pains have been spared."

¹⁸ *Science of Language*, by J. J. Callahan, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, 1938, pp. 235, v. *The Birth of Language*, by R. A. Wilson, J. M. Dent & Sons, London, 1937; pp. xii, 202. *The Wonder of Words*, by Isaac Goldberg; D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1938, pp. xiv, 485, \$3.75.

to make the book "exact, scientific, and . . . not too simple" Further, we are told that "the various chapters have been read by specialists in the particular fields." We have, then, a right to expect a work of vulgarization marked by scholarly accuracy in its generalizations and in its details. And in fact the book is much better than its title would indicate, it is full of good things. But I can not agree with the author of the foreword (p. xii) that it is a "masterly treatment" of its subject. The author was assuredly much interested in language, and he had done much reading in the field, but he did not master his subject. On the contrary, he remained the amateur from first to last, and depended on others for his final judgments. The book includes a number of slips, but these are of less importance than the many discussions of linguistic commonplaces, discussions in the main correct enough but not satisfactory because they were not written by a master. The author's obviously limited understanding of the phenomena with which he dealt made it impossible for him to bring out the points as they should be brought out, even if he usually succeeded in avoiding palpable errors. Such books ought to be written by the learned, not by the laity. But if the learned fail to do their duty by the general public, men like Dr. Goldberg cannot be blamed for leaping into the breach, and this particular book, in spite of grave deficiencies, has much to commend it. The author's general attitude toward linguistic phenomena is sound, and his volume will be found worth the while of the readers for whom it was written.

KEMP MALONE

REVIEWS

The Poetical Career of Alexander Pope. By ROBERT KILBURN ROOT. Princeton (The University Press), 1938. Pp vii + 248. \$2.50.

This book is another effective episode in the rehabilitation of Pope's reputation as a poet. Prejudice against Pope has greatly lessened, but, as Dean Root tells us in his preface, "there remains much in the poetic art of Pope that needs for modern readers interpretation and fresh appraisal." In a "series of essays," as he modestly calls his chapters, "for the most part arranged in such an order as to suggest the progress of his literary career," we survey

Pope's work, using the facts of his career as they throw light on the quality of his work

The volume does not pretend to biographical novelty, and it hardly brings to bear on Pope's individual idiom the acute observation that makes Mr. Tillotson's book serviceable. Not that Root does not give us valuable observations—his insistence on the paragraph, frequently of sonnet-length, as a unit in Pope's expression is an example—but his field is rather general formative influences or interpretative ideas and not specific observations on passages. The first chapter sketches the "canons" of Pope's art—what poetry meant to him: his supposed attitudes toward Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, and Dryden are noted, and there is a more general statement concerning the influence of France and ancient Rome. In this volume, however, neither Horace nor Boileau is writ large. The second chapter ("The Heroic Couplet") is one of the best in the volume, and it presents well Pope's favorite verse form—though neglecting to mention the best things he did outside this form.

With these two chapters of preliminary interest behind us we come to about 75 pages on the earlier poems of Pope and about the same number on the *Dunciad* and later poems. The Imitations of Horace seem not much to interest Root. There is doubtless more of obvious "fancy" and "invention" in the works antedating 1717, and Root is pleased to stress the "romantic" aspects of these works. The word "romantic" for him seems not merely to describe certain tendencies of a period later than Pope's but also to be a word of absolute and high commendation. One must question the justness of an understanding or admiration of Pope that depends on his relation to "romantic" habits of mind—however such habits may be defined.

Pope's art is essentially (but not always) public rather than personal, oratorical rather than lyrical. It is rhetorical in the noble sense of that word—a sense that calls for no apology. His concept of poetry is rightly described here as that of "an exacting social art," but the true nobility of the definition is not adroitly presented. It can be seen in that aspect of Pope's optimism which held that in the past whenever society, government, morals have been in peril, always some

Poet or Patriot rose but to restore
The Faith and Moral, Nature gave before,
Re-lum'd her ancient light, not kindled new,
If not God's image, yet his shadow drew

A *very* exacting social game this, and one that goes somewhat beyond "witty epigram" and "playful fancy" (p 166). Pope took his rôle as satirist more seriously than Root admits. In fact, either modern aestheticians or modern classroom listeners have so much aversion to "reform" and to "moralizing" that these two words

are here used but gingerly. Satire, we are told (p. 196), "requires vision and creative imagination." But just as essential as these is a fine, sure sense of values. (Such a sense Jonathan Swift had, and it is almost sacrilege to call Value as preached by him "Satanic" [p 193]) The chapter on "The Art of Satire" is perhaps most of all Root's chapters open to basic, if transparent, objection. One other unpalatable idea is the echoed concept of the period as "one of the rare periods in the history of thought when all men, or nearly all, are agreed in essentials as to what we ought to do and think, and dispute only as to methods, or as to corollaries of the main propositions" (p 179). Can we here be reading about the eighteenth century?

With regard to the important edition of Pope now in preparation in England Mr Root has made small errors (p 227), correction of which may save future embarrassment. It is being brought out by Methuen, and Mr. Ault's volume of Pope's early *Prose Works* (Blackwell, 1936) is not a part of the edition, which, I believe, includes only the poems (and not the Homer). For the Methuen edition Mr Ault will do the miscellaneous poems. The editor of the *Dunciad* will be Professor J. R. Sutherland (not S. R., as he is here called on p 237). A knowledge of a very neat article by another of these editors¹ would have improved an account of a vexed matter treated by Root on pages 90-91. These are petty mistakes, and there are not many such in the volume. With reservations on the one or two indicated points the book as a whole may be recommended as both illuminating and useful.

GEORGE SHERBURN

Columbia University

Grillparzer, Lessing, and Goethe in the Perspective of European Literature. By FRED O. NOLTE. Lancaster Press, Inc., Lancaster, Pa., 1938. 262 pp. \$2 50.

Against the broad background of European literature Professor Nolte has drawn three interesting studies of Grillparzer, Lessing, and Goethe. These studies are preceded by a chapter on "Subjectivity" and followed by one on "Artistry." According to the author subjectivity is the "seed as well as the soil of modern German literature and thought" (P. 5). Grillparzer, Lessing, and Goethe are, in varying degrees, not only representative of this subjectivity, but also of the introspective and polemical nature of German literature. The fact that the "Blutezeit" of German litera-

¹ Geoffrey Tillotson, "Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Pope's 'Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady,'" RES, xii (1936), 401-12, esp. p 402.

ture followed the Age of Enlightenment, whereas the great periods of English and French literature preceded it, has significant implications

Professor Nolte regards Grillparzer as the dramatist of quietism whose heroines have "a pallor of the convent" While this can be accepted as characteristic of those mentioned by the author, it is not true of many who were omitted This reviewer does not share with the author the feeling that it is a relief when Rahel von Toledo is "disposed of" nor that she is the least convincing of Grillparzer's women. Drawing her from his intimate knowledge of Marie Smolenitz Daffinger, Rahel's prototype, he was able to endow her with traits, which, albeit contradictory and far from admirable, were nevertheless true to the type she was supposed to represent.

The author pays tribute to Grillparzer's keenly inquiring intellect, by comparison with which he regards Schiller's mind as provincial and Hebbel's as barbaric His "refined sensibility, his exceptionally wide perspective, and his pure devotion to poetry as poetry" finally paralyzed him as a dramatic poet, but made him a master in the art of literary appreciation. (P. 55) He concludes his fine appreciation of Grillparzer with these words "In the catholic, delicate appreciation of things poetic and artistic, Grillparzer is not impossibly the most patiently and sensitively cultivated mind in the whole range of European letters." (P. 96)

Lessing, the outstanding representative of the *Aufklärung*, is considered by the author to be the greatest critic since Aristotle. This high place in the history of criticism is due to the fact that Lessing "shrewdly and honestly realized just how far criticism could go without making itself fatuous, or helpless, or unreadable" (P. 150) He is a critic's critic, a man whose maturity and sense of responsibility are fully mirrored in his life and work. His indomitable spirit remained uncowed. He was above all the disciple of truth, rather than the apostle of beauty Regarding his *Faust*, the author makes the surprising statement that we should feel "slight regret" at its fragmentary state, because "Lessing's completed performance would have suffered immeasurably by comparison with Goethe's transcendent achievement" (P. 161)

Realizing the difficulty inherent in an attempt to fix the characteristic significance of a man like Goethe, a man who has the fullest claim to universality, the author succeeds rather well in his attempt to do so He sees Goethe as an affirmer of life and as a man who was at his greatest as a counsellor, as a profoundly reflective poet, and as a poetically articulate thinker.

In his last chapter the author discusses the problem of art and artistic communication. He attacks the cult of "originality" and "genius" and expresses the view that the enlightenment of the three subjects of his book shows itself best in their realization of the literary delusions commonly involved in the conception of ori-

ginality In discussing the pre-eminent social nature of art, he points out that the artist must think and feel in terms of others

The book is, on the whole, an important contribution to the field of literary criticism The author succeeds in seeing his three men in their proper perspective in the vast field of European literature, even though he limits most of his comparisons and allusions largely to English and French writers His comments are at all times stimulating and provocative. The value of the book would be enhanced greatly by the presence of an index and a bibliography.

DOROTHY LASHER-SCHLITT

Brooklyn College

Hauptmann und Shakespeare. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Fortlebens Shakespeares in Deutschland Von FELIX A VOIGT und WALTER A REICHART Mit einem Aufsatz und dramatischen Szenen von Gerhart Hauptmann Breslau Maruschke & Berendt Verlag, 1938 Pp. viii, 154.

Die soziale, politische und wirtschaftliche Zeitkritik im Werke Gerhart Hauptmanns Von HERMANN BARNSTORFF. Jena. Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1938. Pp 155

Felix Voigt has become known in the world of Hauptmann scholarship for his valuable studies on various aspects of Gerhart Hauptmann's life and work. In the present volume he is joined by Professor Reichart in an investigation of Hauptmann's relation to Shakespeare. The study begins with a sketch of Hauptmann's first contacts with Shakespeare's dramas during his Breslau days and traces the influence of Shakespeare on his early dramatic endeavors: the *Lykophron* plan, *Germanen und Römer*, the *Kynast* fragment and the proposed tragedy of Anthony and Cleopatra. There follows an analysis of *Schluck und Jau* and *Indipohdi*. The former play, the authors argue, owes more to *Timon of Athens* than to *The Taming of the Shrew*, while *Indipohdi* is traced to its earliest form in the fragment *Die Insel*, a paraphrase of Shakespeare's *Tempest*.

The core of the book, however, is the third chapter, which discusses Hauptmann's preoccupation with the problems of *Hamlet* during the decade from 1925 to 1936. There is a thorough analysis of Hauptmann's criticism of Shakespeare's tragedy, a comparison with Goethe's standpoint on the same subject, and a critical appraisal of Hauptmann's reconstructed *Hamlet*. Chapter 4 discusses *Hamlet in Wittenberg* and *Im Wirbel der Berufung*, and the last chapter attempts a general comparison between the two dramatists and offers valuable material on Hauptmann's conception of

tragedy and of the tragic hero. An appendix reprints an interesting and not easily accessible essay of Hauptmann's on the text of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, five passages of his own composition which Hauptmann inserted in his translation of *Hamlet*, and the opening speech of I, 2 lines 1-39 in the English version, in Schlegel's translation and in Hauptmann's rendering.

The individual reader may differ with the authors on certain minor points of interpretation, but the work as a whole is a thorough piece of scholarship and a valuable aid to a true understanding of Hauptmann's mind.

Dr. Barnstorff's book is far broader in scope. It is a detailed investigation of Hauptmann's views on the social questions which have agitated our age. Part I enumerates the various periods of history and the geographical locations in which Hauptmann's works are set, and the vocations of his major and minor characters. Part II analyzes Hauptmann's attitude to the State, militarism, imperialism, the family, feminism, motherhood and children, illegitimacy, alcoholism, crime, treason, perjury, prostitution, school and church, clergymen and Roman Catholicism.

The study is certainly thorough and well documented. But one wonders whether there is really much point in looking for a social philosophy in Hauptmann's writings. Can Hauptmann be said to have worked out for himself a systematic attitude towards these problems that Dr. Barnstorff investigates? I have never been able to see Hauptmann as a "thinker" and Dr. Barnstorff's book has not converted me. Indeed it seems to me that Herr Voigt and Professor Reichart might have listed among their similarities between Shakespeare and Hauptmann this recurring tendency to thrust them into the ranks of the philosophers, instead of allowing them to rest on their laurels as creative artists.

Dr. Barnstorff is too often inclined to take the casual remark of a character as evidence of a belief which Hauptmann holds (pp. 63, 74, 91, 95, 104). Or he assumes that because von Wehrhahn is depicted as an object of ridicule, all his views must be contrary to those of Hauptmann (p. 79). This is, of course, an unwarranted conclusion. Hauptmann is too good an artist to create angels and monsters. Wehrhahn is a human being with good and bad qualities of character. And in one instance Dr. Barnstorff attributes to Hauptmann a view which is obviously stated ironically (p. 114).

There are a few slight misprints. p. 73, line 9 *verzugsweise* should read *vorzugsweise*; p. 96, line 4 *Ruschwey* should read *Ruschewey*; p. 104, line 13 *Buchner* should read *Buchner*; p. 119, line 5 from the bottom *'nen* should read *'n*; p. 124, line 22 *sem* should read *seine*; p. 131, line 25 *Orginski* should read *Oginski*.

H. STEINHÄUER

University of Saskatchewan

Die Entstehung der romanischen Volker Von WALTHER VON WARTBURG Halle a/Saale 1939. Pp. 180. 18 esquisses, 5 cartes

M von Wartburg en plus du talent d'organisateur qu'il a amplement démontré dans son FEW, et de celui du linguiste que je qualifierais volontiers de "géopolitique" (en tant que considérant, ainsi que son collaborateur germanisant Th Frings, les *Sprachraum* comme des centres dynamiques, cf p. ex des expressions comme, p 68, "der neue Blutkreislauf des Reichs"), a un grand don pour la vulgarisation claire, aimable et bien ordonnée. C'est dire que son livre sur la genèse des peuples romans, qui élargit ses travaux préalables sur les causes de la différenciation linguistique dans la Romania occidentale jusqu'à des dimensions interromanes, est bien réussi. Je me demande si le titre qui propose l'étude de la genèse des *peuples* romans (et pas seulement des langues romanes, qu'il avait traitées jusqu'ici), n'est pas par trop ambitieux, vu que ce que l'auteur apporte de nouveau, c'est la comparaison des constats des linguistes (et particulièrement ceux de v Wartburg lui-même, point ceux de ses critiques, p ex M. Schurr) avec ceux des historiens. La préhistoire *intérieure* des *peuples* romans me semble encore rester à écrire. Je crois qu'on devra alors compenser la *Ausgliederung*, la séparation et différenciation des peuples romans, par l'esprit d'unité de la *Romania*, conception chère aux romanisants depuis G. Paris et revivifiée par Pirenne. La conception de la Romania est en effet singulièrement pâle et étiquée chez M v Wartburg. c'est une notion à caractère privatif: "durch das gemeinsame sprachliche Erbe *allein* [souligné par moi] sind ja[?] die romanischen Volker zu einer Einheit verbunden". Que M. v W se détrompe en lisant dans *GGA* 1933, p. 332 les remarques judicieuses de M Auerbach sur l'unité des *littératures* romanes et ailleurs sur la notion de la *Vulgarantike*, l'héritage ancien légué aux peuples romans et qui forme le pendant culturel exact du *latin vulgaire*!

On notera un certain engouement pour les Germains (p ex. ce qu'on appelle en général une "invasion germanique" est ici une "Landnahme"; à la p 64, en rétrospective l'histoire des insuccès militaires des Romains en Germanie montre à M. v W. une action de la Providence qui, après avoir "gaspillé les forces indoeuropéennes" au bord de la Méditerranée, a gardé en réserve "une dernière source de force populaire intacte et entière" pour renouveler l'Occident exténué—est-ce un spenglérisme mis à la page?), une aversion un peu trop marquée, pour ne pas être du à des idées courantes sur l'influence sémitique, pour le "artfremder Maure" en Espagne, qui n'aurait, contrairement à ce que nous savons par les travaux de Menéndez Pidal, agi que négativement (alors que la fusion des races germanique et romane était productive), et une belle adhésion

(plus feime que pour la Belgique) aux idéaux d'une Suisse racialement et linguistiquement diversifiée, mais unifiée par la *Schicksalsgemeinschaft*¹ multiséculaire et par sa liberté

Le volume intéressant de M. v W est dédié à son collègue de Chicago, William A Nitze

LEO SPITZER

Lingua e cultura (studi linguistici) By GIULIO BERTONI Florence: Olschki. 1939. Pp 301.

Ce livre contenant des articles publiés antérieurement et qui forme une trilogie avec les volumes "Lingua e Pensiero" (1932) et "Lingua e Poesia" (1937), s'inspire comme les autres des idées de Croce sur *l'espressione* comme principe fondamental de la langue et, par conséquent, de la linguistique. Ce sont des études particulièrement de stylistique, qui relient des faits observés par l'auteur en italien et en galloroman à des faits de civilisation connus. On remarquera aussi des études ressortissant à la politique (politique linguistique, s'entend), sur l'expansion de l'italien et sur 'l'ancienne et la nouvelle *questione della lingua*' (ici j'aurais aimé qu'à l'idée du Dante, modelée sur ses conceptions de la divinité, de la langue nationale ne s'identifiant avec nul dialecte et pourtant immanente dans chacun, fût rendue la justice qu'elle mérite elle peut ne pas être vraie au point de vue de la genèse de l'italien—d'ailleurs il y a des langues qui sont nées ainsi que le Dante le postule pour l'italienne—, elle est certainement vraie au point de vue *phénoménique* et les suggestions de M. Bertoni lui-même, d'unifier l'italien en mettant en accord les prononciations de Florence et de Rome avec les postulats de la linguistique, sont bien dans la ligne dantéenne) On goûtera particulièrement les études, d'une philologie solide, sur la prose de la *Vita nuova*, sur la langue de Renée de France dans ses lettres, sur l'origine de la préposition italienne *da* (= *unde* + *ad*) et sur les reflets de coutumes juridiques dans la poésie des troubadours ce dernier article, merveilleux par les multiples connaissances de détails réunies pour établir un

¹ Dois-je dire que la conception renanienne du peuple comme unité s'affirmant par un "plébiscite le tous les jours" me semble plus conforme à la réalité que la soumission passive à un *fatum* qui est en somme le *factum* historique? L'expression "Entstehung der . . . Volker" a pour moi une nuance rationaliste qui jure avec ce fatalisme. On pourrait dire M v W. ne semble réaliser ni ce que sont des *peuples* romans ni des *peuples romans*. Je me demande quelle peut être sa définition de l'esprit *européen*: à coup sûr, antipode de celle de Valéry (Hellade—Rome—chrétienté), elle inclurait les Germains—on n'ose pas penser qu'elle exclurait la Grèce dont il est fait si peu de cas dans ce livre. Pour M v W, le motto d'une revue romanistique bien connue devrait être varié ainsi "Non esiste la latinità, razze germaniche esistono" . . .

trait de style général, rejoint celui de M. Wechssler sur les expressions féodales et ceux de M. Scheludko sur les expressions tirées de la rhétorique en a. prov. et nous porte à admettre un certain "réalisme des troubadours" (d'ailleurs bien connu par les *serventes*), à savoir une inclusion d' à peu près toutes les connaissances du moyen âge, cette "Weltbreite" affleurant sous forme de métaphores dans une poésie soi-disant idéaliste qui, en affirmant le spirituel, ne tourne pas le dos au monde—comme la *domna* chantée par les troubadours, toute idéale qu'elle paraît, est une femme bien vivante, ne se refusant pas au monde et à la société.

La science de M. Bertoni est elle-même définie par cette *domna* provençale elle est spirituelle, tout en ne refusant pas des assises solides dans la réalité. Je dois dire que, des deux manières que cultive ce savant, l'investigation réaliste et le programme idéaliste (qui se trouve ici exprimé en beaucoup de lieux, particulièrement dans le prologue et l'épilogue du livre), j'aime mieux la première : M. Bertoni est le plus convaincant idéaliste quand il se meut parmi les matériaux qu'il domine si bien, les littératures et les langues du moyen âge français et italien,—moins quand il fait de la théorie. Faudrait-il encore évoquer la comparaison de cette *domna* provençale dont le sourire est divin quand il éclôt sur cette bouche *visible*, mais qui a moins su nous transmettre sa pensée, toute de spiritualité? Ou, pour employer un parallèle plus viril, M. Bertoni est comme le peintre dont la vie intime la plus intense s'épanche déjà dans le broyement, le choix et le groupement des couleurs : l' "idée" de la peinture ressort le mieux, non pas quand il parle d'elle, mais quand il emploie ses couleurs, ses matériaux bien-aimés "Il ne peut qu'il ne voie ce à quoi il songe et songe ce qu'il voit. Ses moyens même font partie de l'espace de son art. Point de chose plus vivante aux regards qu'une boîte de couleurs ou une palette chargée," a écrit Valéry de l'artiste. Diminuerai-je le grand savant qu'est M. Bertoni en désirant le voir toujours tout près de ses "boîtes de couleurs" et laisser à Croce l'élaboration de la philosophie du langage, assuré que je suis que Bertoni philologue donnera toujours une vue spiritualiste plus graphique que s'il se meut dans l'air raréfié des idées pures? Je crois en effet que le grand philologue contribue à l'idéalité de sa science en la traduisant par la *peinture* il est plutôt *traducteur* d'idées en matière sensible, qu'idéateur. La pensée philologique, comme toute autre, est la plus active en tant qu'*incarnée*.

P 80 L'assertion "il francese *acheter* (comperare) è di derivazione genovese," ainsi exprimée, me semble surprenante — P 86 les langues germaniques n'auraient pas de termes empruntés à l'italien pour la vie intérieure? Et *dolce far mente, morbidezza* etc! — P. 151 je ne comprends pas bien l'explication d' a. prov. *beure sa folia* 'supporter les conséquences de la propre folie' par l'amende employée pour acheter du vin pour le juge. Il faudrait p.-ê. citer l'article de Schutz-Gora, *Germ-rom Monatsschr* IV, 277 — P. 159, il faudra traiter de *sus del cap li ren mo gatge* ensemble

avec l'all *uberhaupt*, qui au moyen âge a signifié 'ohne die Stucke zu zahlen, ganz, all' (*man gab in das vihe umb ein bescheiden gelt uberhaupt, er gewan Rôme uber houbet*, Lexer) ce sera le geste de la soumission absolue, qui contient aussi la soumission totale. De là le sens de m h a *uber houbet fechten* 'wider den strom schwimmen' (*Dtsch Wb* s v *uberhaupt*, A 1), c à d 'faire quelque chose d'inutile'—P 172, n 1 lire McKenzie au lieu de K Kenzie—P 253 l'article sur la langue de Rabelais me semble moins original que les autres. M B est encore sous l'emprise de l'idée du "hardi rationaliste" qu' a lancée l'école française, et ne voit pas assez le caractère rationnel irrationnel du plus grand poète "cosmique" de la France. V mon article dans *Rom Stil- und Literaturstudien* II

LEO SPITZER

Un Philosophe Cosmopolite du XVIII^e Siècle, le Chevalier de Chastellux Par FANNY VARNUM. Paris Librairie Rodstein, 1936. Pp. 269.

François-Jean de Beauvoir, chevalier, puis marquis de Chastellux, soldat, philosophe, économiste, auteur de comédies et de nombreux essais, esprit cosmopolite et encyclopédique, méritait mieux que les études fragmentaires qui lui avaient été jusqu'ici consacrées. Sans être un auteur de premier plan, il fut un témoin significatif, un exemple marquant de ces aristocrates, assez nombreux à la fin du dix-huitième siècle, qui s'étaient libérés presque entièrement des préjugés de leur caste, tout en conservant une grande élégance de manières. Homme du monde, homme de goût, d'intellect affiné, anglophile mais non pas "anglomaniac," ami enthousiaste mais non pas aveugle des "Insurgents," tel nous l'a dépeint avec justesse Miss Varnum dans une monographie bien documentée et simplement écrite. Son œuvre dramatique est mince et peut sans inconvénient être négligée. Par contre ses essais constituent des documents précieux sur les modifications que subissait le goût à la fin du dix-huitième siècle, sur la pénétration des influences anglaises et sur les modes littéraires. Disciple de Montesquieu, disciple de Voltaire, disciple de Hume, conservant cependant quelque indépendance de jugement, Chastellux apporte le témoignage d'un homme moyen et cultivé. Ceci dit, il faut reconnaître que cette modération même qui paraît dans le traité de la *Félicité publique* l'a empêché d'exercer une action forte sur un public ami des opinions tranchées, des paradoxes et des systèmes. Aujourd'hui encore, son principal titre reste les deux volumes des *Voyages dans l'Amérique Septentrionale dans les années 1780, 1781 et 1782* (Paris, 1786). Aussi devons-nous remercier Miss Varnum d'avoir donné en appendice des extraits de l'ouvrage dont il n'existe pas de réimpression moderne. On y verra comment le voyageur français a su observer, peindre et faire vivre les personnages les plus marquants de la Révolution américaine et des forces expéditionnaires françaises, de Washington à Robert

Morris, de Lafayette au fameux Colonel Armand. Tout en notant la place faite à l'étude des *Voyages* et aux controverses qui suivirent la publication, on peut trouver que la monographie de Miss Varnum tourne un peu court. Les dernières années de la vie de Chastellux sont condensées en un paragraphe bien sec (p. 199). Il ne semble même pas que la date de la mort du marquis ait été indiquée. On ne saurait en faire une critique très grave à l'auteur qui a été la première à indiquer et à regretter les lacunes forcées de son travail, dues au refus des descendants de Chastellux de laisser consulter les archives familiales. Elle pourra se consoler en songeant qu'elle est ainsi admise dans l'honorable mais trop nombreuse société des historiens que des dragons jaloux ont écartés de la toison d'or.

GILBERT CHINARD

Princeton University

Crime and Punishment in the Old French Romances By F. CARL RIEDEL. New York Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. viii + 197. \$2. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, No. 135).

In supplying a commentary on crime, criminals, trials, and punishments in a selected group of Old French romances Mr. Riedel has written an interesting and useful book. Usually his comments are convincing and even when they are not, they are highly suggestive. No scholar who is dealing with these romances can afford to neglect Mr. Riedel's work. Moreover although Mr. Riedel seems to have written his book for this special audience, I believe that mediaeval historians in general can draw some benefit from it. The social historian who wishes to use the extensive material supplied by contemporary literature is always faced with the problem of deciding how accurately the romances depict the actual life and thoughts of their day. By comparing the treatment of criminals in the romances with that prescribed by contemporary customary law Mr. Riedel has supplied a touch-stone which this reviewer at least expects to find very useful. Furthermore it seems possible that this book may contain an interesting suggestion for the legal historian. Mr. Riedel has used the legal sources to explain the romances. Might not legal historians reverse the process and seek in contemporary literature useful comments on their legal texts?

The chief general criticism that may be made of Mr. Riedel's work is that he is too liberal in his definition of "contemporary customary law". He is fully aware of this danger, but is inclined to forget it when he comes to explaining incidents in the romances. For instance it seems highly improbable that a thirteenth century

trouvère knew anything about the *Lex Burgundionum*. The chapter entitled "criminal law in the thirteenth century" is not very satisfactory. Mr. Riedel attempts to discuss this subject in greater detail than his book requires or his knowledge justifies. As a result he not only presents many facts which simply confuse the reader but he also falls into several minor errors. The mistakes on page fifteen may be taken as fair samples. The king of France in 1191 was not Philip I but Philip II. Then the statement "the viscount presided over regional courts under royal jurisdiction" is very questionable. Not until they absorbed Normandy did the French kings have local officers called viscounts and then only in that province. Moreover even in Normandy the viscount's own jurisdiction extended to only the most minor offences. When he presided over courts dealing with serious cases, it was as a deputy of the bailli, the real local officer of the Capetian kings. But these are insignificant errors which detract in no way from the value of Mr. Riedel's book.

SIDNEY PAINTER

The Johns Hopkins University

Studies in Modern Romansh Poetry in the Engadine. By MILDRED ELIZABETH MAXFIELD. Planographed by Edwards Bros., Ann Arbor, Mich., 1938. Pp. xi + 310.

Miss Maxfield has certainly done a service to the cause of Romance Linguistics by publishing this monograph. While Romansh (Surselvan and Ladin), for certain linguistic reasons, is not included in the field of Italian dialects, anyone who is thoroughly acquainted with the Northern dialects of Italy and is somewhat of a linguistic gymnast can read the selections in Miss Maxfield's book, which is in the nature of an Anthology of Modern Romansh Poetry, both with profit and pleasure. For many of the poems she has given her own excellent translations. The biographies of Pallioppi, Caderas, and Linsel are well done and the critical material is well handled. It is only to be regretted that on pp. 268-9, while dealing with the differences between Surselvan and Ladin, she did not include the phonetic symbols which would have made the reader more certain of the pronunciation indicated by the written word.

On pp. 36-8 mention is made of the manuscript of the dictionary compiled by Zaccaria Pallioppi and abridged for publication by his son Emil, and on p. 37 is given an extract from the MS. with the corresponding published abridgement. While the abridgement is well done, it is to be regretted that the entire work cannot be published, as the elder Pallioppi was a great pioneer scholar in his chosen field. Of course he lacked the tools which we have today

and which are contributing to bring the fields of phonetics and phonology into the realm of the more exact sciences. It is at least to be hoped that the manuscript can be preserved for scholars of this and future generations.

Friulians may not like Miss Maxfield's statement on p. 2 that their dialect "has never produced any considerable literature of value outside of a certain record of interesting folklore" as they point with pride to their Zorzut, but it is true that the language of Graubunden excels that of Friuli in literary value. For certain kinds of lyrics Romansh, like some of the Italian dialects, lacking in artificiality, is more expressive than the more polished languages. It attains charm through its freshness and *naiveté*. The sentiments are expressed in so intimate a manner that they seem to reveal the very soul of the poet. As an example let me cite the tenth stanza of Pallioppi's *Partenza*

O craja, figl, che l'or nun detta,
Ne possa der felicitè
Scha tu nun hest un' orma netta
Un cour impheu da charited,

which, in order to illustrate the close relationship between Italian and Romansh I shall translate into Italian.

E credi, figlio, che l'oro non dà,
Nè puo dare la felicità
Se non hai l'anima pura,
Il cuore pieno di carità

H. H. VAUGHAN

The University of California

Boccaccio's Story of Tito e Gisippo in European Literature By
LOUIS SORIERI. New York. Institute of French Studies, 1937.
Pp. 268.

Dr. Sorieri has presented a noteworthy history of the origins and filiations of the 98th *novella* of the *Decameron*, in every field of literary endeavor for Italy, France, England, Germany, and Spain. The value of his investigations, however, would be considerably enhanced by restricting the analysis to close associations of the rival-friend plot. Although the Introduction warns that the study is limited "to an examination of all translations and direct adaptations of Tito and Gisippo and of as many derivations in each country as space and other factors permitted," the ensuing analysis wanders from the prescribed bounds. It is difficult to justify inclusion of distant antecedents such as the Stratonice-Seleucus, the half-friend, and the loyal-wife themes when many analogues involving the sacrificial motif in friendship are ignored. This incon-

sistency is further aggravated by the fact that the same yardstick is not used in all of the chapters.

Since the theme under discussion is a novellistic one, we may be excused for singling out the section devoted to the *novella* to develop the criticism.

In the 1st *novella* of Ser Giovanni's *Il Pecorone*, which introduces the analysis, there is not a single reference to either friend or friendship. If we justify its existence in this chapter on the ground that Masuccio's 21st *novella* is analogous to it, then it is reasonable to expect mention of Villegas' *Historia del Abencerraje y la hermosa Jarifa* in the chapter on Spain. Of Masuccio's collection Nos. 21, 38 and 44 are examined but No. 41 (repeated by Parabosco as No. 2 of his *Diporti*) which treats of a severe test of friendship under the guise of a crude practical joke, is absent. The related motif of the husband who forces a friend to test his wife for him is likewise missing from this chapter, although it occurs in the analysis of Greene's *Philomela* in the English section. Treatment of these motifs would add analogues from Sermini and Barbagli in Italian, and from Mateo Alemán and Cervantes in Spanish.

Some of the examples missing from the analysis are. for Italy—the twenty-fourth *novella* of Sercambi (Renier ed.), the second and fifth of Granucci's *L'Eremata, la Carcere e'l Diporto*, the sixth and seventh of Erizzo's *Sei Giornate*, the second of Brevio's *Novelle*, Bandello's twenty-seventh of Part I, and the fortieth of Part II; the sixth of Firenzuola (in spite of note 22, p. 75), the third and fourth of Zambrini's collected *Novelle Antiche*, for Spain—the nineteenth of Sanchez's *El Libro de los Exemplos por a b. c* (ed Morel-Fatio, *Romana* VII [1878]), Ch 31 of the *Castigos y Documentos del Rey Don Sancho*, B. A. E. I.

An acquaintance with Stith Thompson's *Motif Index of Folk-Literature* and the second volume of Di Francia's *Novellistica* (1925) would have added many more derivatives and analogues.

Notwithstanding such omissions Dr. Sorieri has succeeded in showing that a "rather continuous sequence exists in the successive treatment," and in the process, he has made available some extremely rare material. The study is a welcome addition to the study of inter-relationships.

D. P. ROTUNDA

Mills College, California

BRIEF MENTION

Joseph Bédier 1864-1938. By FERDINAND LOT. PARIS: E. Droz, 1939. Pp. 53. This brief work by one distinguished mediaevalist about another, by a stylist about a stylist, by a friend about a friend,

is informative, scholarly, charming and—yes—amusing. Its account of Bédier's intellectual life and his solution of textual and literary problems, couched in the clear pleasing style we expect of even the most erudite French scholars, is peppered by humorous comments on personalities and institutions. The friendship which dictated the work did not involve harmonious opinion on all matters. Professor Lot frankly disagreed on the question of the spontaneous generation of the French epic, although he approved as "acquis et intangible" the theory of propagation of the epic on the pilgrim routes, by minstrels influenced by the tales and traditions of the sanctuaries at which they halted. On the point of disagreement Bédier had prepared to "exterminate" his friend: "Avec quelle émotion j'attendais cette joute suprême!" writes Lot. The little book follows Bédier from his school days at Louis le Grand to his establishment at the Collège de France, where until his retirement he held the chair that Gaston Paris had honoured. "Le trouvère Bédier" made his reputation by his *Roman de Tristan et Iseult*, reconstructed from the fragmentary XII century versions of Béroul and of Thomas. It was however to his more controversial *Légendes épiques* that he owed his greatest renown. To these may be added his editions and translations of the *Chanson de Roland*. Meanwhile in the realm of pure scholarship Bédier emasculated Lachmann's methods of manuscript classification and disposed of those of Dom Quentin. Of the events of his private life we learn nothing, of his behaviour therein much. He was as conformist there as, in the intellectual realm, he was "la tête la plus cartésienne que j'aie connue," refusing to accept unexamined dicta even from Gaston Paris. The end of Bédier's life came suddenly last summer. Lot and he parted in friendship after a garden party, convinced that their critical opinions were irreconcilable. "Il s'en alla de son pas léger, le port droit, le tête haute, à son habitude. Je ne devais plus le revoir." The few pages of the book give us—and with grace—a picture of the whole intellectual man. It should not escape the eye of those who care for scholarship.

CAROLINE RUUTZ-REES

Greenwich, Conn

Poèmes de transition (XV^e-XVI^e siècle). Par MARCEL FRANÇON. Rondeaux du MS. 402 de Lille. Cambridge Harvard Univ Press and Paris Droz, 1938. Pp. 771. In this volume M. Françon offers to scholars the 601 *rondeaux* of MS. 402 in the Bibliothèque de Lille. The collection embraces for the most part the reign of Louis XII, though there are scattered allusions in the poems to the early years of Francis I and an occasional backward glance at the period of Charles VIII. The verses, then, are transitional in a chronological sense and might be expected to give a foretaste of

later Renaissance literary trends. However, such is scarcely the case. The poems for the most part are steeped in the *rhétoriqueur* tradition of artificiality, flamboyance, and allegory. There are a few mythological references, but many more to the personages of the *Roman de la Rose*. Priam and his compatriots are met much less frequently than Danger, Faulx-Danger, Desespoir, and even Bel-Accueil. In addition to the stereotyped and standardized lovers' laments, some of the poems treat general subjects like Courtoisie, Mort, and Fortune, the last at times with a slight realistic touch. The authors are generally anonymous, but a number of the poems can be assigned to such well-known *rhétoriqueurs* as Jean Marot, Octovien de Saint-Gelais, Henri Baude, and Georges Chastellain. The collection was evidently destined for a society both aristocratic and literary, since the poets to whom the verses can be reasonably attributed were all living in the *entourages* of the royal courts of Charles VIII, Louis XII, and Francis I. Also, the poems themselves reveal in acrostichs the names of ladies like Louise de Savoie, Anne de Quesnai, Louise de Graille, and others. The pieces are all *rondeaux* of the type a a b b a, a a b R, a a b b a R, where R is the *rentiement*, or repetition of the first syllables of the first verse. M. F. has equipped his edition with a rather full introduction wherein he approaches the problem of what, when, and where was the Renaissance, a problem that has been occupying scholars anew in recent years, but is too ample for an introduction. M. F. rightly concludes that his series of *rondeaux* is no group of masterpieces. He is correct, though, in justifying his edition on the basis of its portrayal of "la pensée de nos aïeux" and of its giving "les indices d'une civilisation." Literary history does not have to concern itself solely with primary figures and movements. The work of M. François very properly contains a preface by Professor Henri Guy, whose study on *rhétoriqueur* poetry has so long been an accepted standard.

W. L. WILEY

The University of North Carolina

A Concordance of Ovid. By R. J. DEFERRARI, SISTER M. INVIOLOATA BARRY, MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE. Washington Catholic University, 1939. Pp ix + 2220 (lithotyped). \$20.00. The authors call this extensive work "a combination of concordance and *index verborum*," as they have wisely omitted a number of "constantly recurring and relatively colorless words." It will doubtless be found useful, if the price does not prove to be prohibitive, by students of modern languages and literatures as well as by students of Latin, for no author was better known during the Middle Ages and Renaissance than Ovid.

H. C. L.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIV

DECEMBER, 1939

Number 8

BIBLIOGRAPHIE ZUR THEORIE UND TECHNIK DES DEUTSCHEN ROMANS (1910-1938)

Eine Zusammenstellung des vor 1910 erschienenen Schrifttums über die Technik des deutschen Romans liegt uns bereits in der Bibliographie C. H. Handschins vor.¹ Als Ergänzung dazu soll nachstehende Zusammenstellung dienen.

Eine nähere Betrachtung des Gesamtbildes führt zunächst zu der Feststellung, dass seit 1910 manches Neue und Interessante hinzugekommen ist. Jedoch fällt sofort auf, dass es sich dabei um in der Problemstellung stark begrenzte Einzeluntersuchungen handelt. Wohl fehlt es nicht an neuen grundlegenden Werken, die zu weiterem Wurfes ausholen in der Wesenbestimmung der Erzählkunst, aber ein zusammenfassendes Werk über die deutsche Roman-kunst als solche, sei es nun die eines ganzen Jahrhunderts oder wenigstens einer literarischen Schule—wie wir es z. B. in Dibelius' Buch über den englischen Roman finden²—steht nach wie vor aus.

Das Vorhandensein dieser eigentümlichen Lucke im Schrifttum der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft drängt zu der Frage nach einer Erklärung. Dem aus den zahlreichen Einzeluntersuchungen ersichtlichen regen Interesse nach zu urteilen, dürfte die Erklärung kaum in einer natürlichen Zurückhaltung gegen die Behandlung des dichterischen Kunstwerkes nach technischen Gesichtspunkten zu suchen sein.³ Vielmehr liegt die Vermutung nahe, dass die er-

¹ "Bibliographie zur Technik des neueren deutschen Romans," *MLN.*, xxiv, Dez 1909 und xxv, Jan 1910.

² Wilhelm Dibelius: *Englische Romankunst Die Technik des englischen Romans im achtzehnten und zu Anfang des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (Palaestra XCII)* Berlin 1910

³ Eine gewisse Abneigung gegen den Begriff "Technik" ist allerdings noch nicht gänzlich überwunden Vgl E Ermatinger: *Das dichterische Kunstwerk* S 307

heblichen Schwierigkeiten, die sich dem Forscher auf diesem Gebiet der deutschen Literaturbetrachtung entgegenstellen, die Ausführung eines umfassenden Werkes bis jetzt verhindert haben. Das individuell Betonte in der deutschen Literatur macht sich gerade auch in der Formgebung bemerkbar und eben diese Tatsache erschwert den Versuch einer richtungsgebenden Festlegung allgemeiner Formprinzipien, wie sie im Roman anderer Völker, vornehmlich der romanischen, erkennbar sind. Erst auf Grund einer Untersuchung nach diesem Gesichtspunkt liesse sich entscheiden, in wie weit man von einer deutschen Romantechnik reden kann, und davon durfte dann auch das Erscheinen eines zusammenfassenden Werkes abhängen.

Zu der Bibliographie sei bemerkt, dass von den Zeitungsartikeln nur die wichtigsten eingeschlossen wurden. Was die Abkürzungen anbetrifft, so decken sie sich im wesentlichen mit den im *Jahresbericht der neueren deutschen Literatur* gebräuchlichen.

I. THEORIE

- Floersheim, A. *Der 'Versuch über den Roman' des Freiherrn v. Blankenburg. Ein Beitr. z. Gesch. d. Romantheorie.* Diss. München 1925 (Masch.)
- Hollander, W. v. "Ergebnisse einer Romantheorie," *Das deutsche Wort*, xii, 18 (1936)
- Koch, J. G. *Gutzkows Theorie des Romans in seinem Roman „Hohenschwangau“* Diss. Breslau, 1936. Teildr. Forst (Lausitz), 1936
- Koskimies, R. *Theorie des Romans* Helsinki, 1935
- Lilienfein, H. "Zur Geschichte und Theorie von Roman und Novelle," *LE*, xvii (1915), 1041-46
- Lukacs, G. *Die Theorie des Romans, ein geschichtsphilos. Versuch u. d. Formen d. grossen Epik* Berlin, 1920. Auch in *Zfsth*, xi (1916), 225-71; 390-431
- Minners, K. *Die Theorie des Romans in d. dtsh. Aufklärung mit bes. Berücksicht. von Blankenburgs „Versuch u. d. Roman“* Diss. Hamburg, 1922 (1923) (Masch.)
- Ohrenstein, I. *Die Theorie des Romans seit dem Wilhelm Meister.* Diss. Wien, 1922
- Schmidt, F. *Spitteler u. d. Theorie d. grossen Epik. Ein Beitr. z. Philos. d. Litgesch.* Diss. Erlangen, 1924 (Masch.)
- Sommerfeld, M. "Romantheorie und Romantypus d. dtsh. Aufklärung," *DtVjs*, iv (1926), 459-90
- Wolff, M. L. *Geschichte der Romantheorie mit bes. Berücksicht. d. dtsh. Verhältnisse* (Diss. München) Nürnberg, 1915.

II. TECHNIK

A. Allgemeines · In Technik und Theorie Einschlagiges.

- Bab, J. "Von der Kunst des Erzählens," *Gegenwart*, LXXX (1911), 753-55
(Siehe auch Artikel in *Pester Lloyd* 25/4 1911, *Berl Tbl* 31/8 1919, *Leipz Lehrzeitg*; Lit Beil 7, 27 Jg, 1920)
- Belzner, E "Das Problem des modernen Epos," *Horen*, IV (1928), 1026-30.
- Benda, O *Die Kunstform des Erziehungsromans* (In *42 Jahresber d dtsh Oberrealschule in Triest*) Triest, 1912
- Beise, A "Kunst des Erzählens," *Karl May-Jahrb*, IX (1926), 29
—— "Kunst geschichtl Erzählung," *KonsMtschr*, LXXIV (1917), 531-38
- Binding, R G "Neue deutsche Erzählungskunst," *Frankf Ztg*, 28/11, 1913
- Bonsels, W "Der Roman als Kunstform," *Lit*, XXVI (1923), 1-2
—— "Neue Romane als Kunstwerke," *DtStrafrechtsztg*, V (1917), 14
- Borchardt, H H *Geschichte des Romans und der Novelle in Deutschland* I. Leipzig, 1926
- Borkowsky, E "Zur Technik des neuen Romans," *Buchervurm*, VII (1921), 168
—— "Erzählungskunst und Romanproblematik," *Buchervurm*, V (1919), 115-18
- Brandenburg, H "Die Kunst der Erzählung," *NLit*, XXXIX (1938), 273-92
- Bühner, K H "Probleme der neuen Erzählkunst," *Lit*, XXXII (1930), 336-37
- Castelle, F "Die Romankunst," *Die Bergstadt* (Breslau), X (1921), 274-79
- Doblin, A "Der Bau des epischen Werks," *NRs*, XL, I (1929), 527-51
- Durr, E "Die Objektivität des Erzählers" (Neue Romane von Otto Flake), *Lit*, XXX (1927), 14 f
- Ermatinger, E "Die epische Wirkungsform" In *Das dichtersche Kunstwerk* Leipzig-Berlin, 1921. 331-87
- Everth, E "Die Kunst der Erzählung," *ZAsth*, XXIII (1925), 215-47
- Fischer, E K "Im Kampf um die neue Romanform," *Lit*, XXXI (1929), 568-71
- Fischer-Wingendorff "Von der verlorengegangenen Kunst des Erzählers," *LE*, XXIII (1920), 129-34
- Flake, O "Der Roman heute und morgen," *NSchwRs*, XXI (1928), 700-707.
—— "Epik," *NRs*, XLVI, 2 (1935), 658-63
- Flemming, W *Epik u Dramatik Versuch ihrer Wesensdeutung* (Wissen u Wirken, 27 Bd) Karlsruhe, 1925
- Forstreuter, K *Die deutsche Icherzählung. Eine Studie zu ihrer Geschichte und Technik* (Germ Stud XXXIII). Berlin, 1924
- Franck, H *Deutsche Erzählungskunst* Trier, 1922.
- Fritsch, K W "Deutsche Erzählkunst der Gegenwart," *Freie Welt*, V (1925), 12-20.

- Gaite, H *Kunstform Schauerroman Eine morpholog Begriffsbestimmung des Sensationsromans im 18 Jahr von Walpoles „Castle of Otranto“ bis Jean Pauls „Titan“* (Diss Leipzig) Leipzig, 1935
- Geller, M *Friedrich Spielhagens Theorie und Praxis des Romans* (Schr LitGesBonn, N F X) Berlin, 1917
- Grellmann, H "Roman," *Rlg*, xii (Merkei Stammler), 63-73
- Grolman, A v "Die deutsche Romanform," *MunchN Nachr* 3/3 (1935)
- Gunther, J "Erzahlung und Roman," *Europ Revue*, xiii, 9 (1938), xiv, 3 (1938)
- Harich, W "Der Fortsetzungsroman," *Lit*, xxxii (1929), 9-10 u 75-76
- Havemann, J "Die Bedeutung d Handlung in d erzähl Dichtung," *Eckart*, vii (1912), 25-33
- Henssen, G "Volkstumliche Erzählerkunst," *Zs d Vereins fr rhein u westfal Volkskunde* (Jetzt *Zs fneudt Volkskunde*), xxxii (1935), 2-35
- Hirt, E *Das Formgesetz der epischen, dramatischen, und lyrischen Dichtung* (Diss Zurich), Leipzig-Berlin, 1923
- Huebner, F M "Objektivitat als notwendige Aufgabe Feststellungen fur den Roman," *GRMon*, viii (1920), 72-85
- Hulsen, H v "Roman als Kunstform," *Tat*, iv (1913), 556-73
- Kamp, G "Gedanken über das Wesen des modernen Romans," *Grat*, xviii (1924), 603-10
- Keckeis, G "Zeitgenoss Erzählungskunst," *LitHandw*, lvi (1920), 49-56
- Klockner, A "Gestaltwandel der deutschen Erzählung," *Kunst u Wissen*, xlv (1928), 1 f
- Kohn-Bramstedt, E. "Zur Typenlehre des Epikers Über Th Mann u J. Wassermann," *ZÄsth*, xxiii (1929), 136-47
- Kolbenheyer, E G *Wie wurde der deutsche Roman Dichtung** Munchen, 1933 Auch in *ZfdB*, xii (1936), 465-75 —Englisch "The Art of the German Novel," *Germ Life and Letters*, i (1936), 18-30
- Kost, E. *Die Technik des deutschen Romans von Musaus bis Goethe, bes in ihren Beziehungen z d Romanen Fieldings u Smollets* Diss Tubingen, 1922 (1923) (Masch)
- Krebs, S "Zur Kunstform des Romans," *PrJbb*, 146 (1911), 311-20.
- Litzmann, B "Von neuer Erzählungskunst," *MLitGesBonn*, vii (1913)
- Lutzeler, H *Kunst und Unkunst im Gegenwartsroman* Bonn, 1930
- "Kunst und Unkunst in der Erzählung," *Buchervelt*, xxvi (1929), 401-18
- Mann, Th 'Versuch über das Theater' (1910) In *Rede und Antwort* (Gesammelte Werke) Berlin, 1922. 18-66
- Messlány, R "Erzählungskunst und erzählende Dichtung," *Grenzboten*, Nr. 19 (1912)
- "Roman und Epos," *Grenzboten*, Nr 21 (1913).
- Michels, J "Gestaltungsformen des Romans," *Köln Volksztg*, 24/5. (1936), 23/1 (1937)
- Muhlestein, H "Epische und dramatische Gestaltung," *Bund* (Bern) *Lit Beil*, xxix (1935).

- Nordhausen, R "Wesen, Technik und Entwicklungsmöglichkeiten des Volksromans," *Hochwacht*, x (1910)
- Pauls, E E "Vom Roman zur Anekdote," *ZfDkde*, XLVI (1932), 32-39
- Petsch, R "Epische Grundformen," *GRMon*, xvi (1928), 379-99
- "Von deutscher Erzählkunst," *DtVt*, Jg 1934, 15-27
- *Wesen und Formen der Erzählkunst* (*DtVjs* Buchreihe Bd 20) Halle/Saale 1934
- Rang, B "Vom Wesen des epischen Kunstwerkes," *Hefte f Bucherwesen*, xvi (1932), 1-10, 65-76
- Rauch, K "Formproblem des modernen Romans," *Köln Ztg*, 19/3 (1936)
- Reich, H "Der biologische Roman der Antike und das Ringen um die Neugestaltung moderner epischer Kunst," *Philol philos Studien, Festschr f Eduard Wechsler* 1929, 181-95
- Reuter, H de "Die neue Gestalt und der neue Gehalt des modernen Romans," *Gral*, XXI (1927), 43-46
- Schafer, W "Epik" In *Der deutsche Gott* München, 1923 113-59
- "Epik oder Zustandsschilderung," *NLit*, XXXVIII (1937), 175-81.
- Schmidt, A *Zur Kunstform des Gegenwartsromans* Wien, 1936
- Scholz, W "Von der Kunst des Romans," *NRs*, XXXIX, I (1928), 87-95
- "Zur Kunst des Romans" *Lit Welt*, IX (1933), 5
- Seuffert, B "Beobachtungen über dichterische Komposition" *GRMon*, I (1909), 599-617
- Spiero, H "Vom Requisit des Romans," *Königsb Hart Ztg*, Stegbeil 333 (1925).
- Sternberger, D "Eine neue Gestalt des Bildungsromans," *NRs*, XLVII, I (1936), 667-72
- Suskind, W E "Wege der Erzählung," *Lit*, XXXVI (1934), 682-87
- Walzel, O "Deutsches Erzählen um 1900," *ZfäB*, VII (1931), 233-44
- *Die künstlerische Form des Dichtwerks* Berlin, 1916
- "Erzählkunst um 1900," *Köln Ztg*, Wochenausg, 4 März (1931), 9-10
- "Erzählungsstil von heute," *Baden-Badener Bühnenbl*, v, 42
- "Formeigenheiten des Romans" In *Das Wortkunstwerk* Leipzig, 1926 125-151 (Zuerst *Int Monatsschr*, VIII (1914), 1329 ff)
- "Leitmotive in Dichtungen" In *Das Wortkunstwerk*, 152-81 (Zuerst in *Zs f Bucherfreunde*, N F, VIII (1917), 261 ff)
- "Objektive Erzählung" In *Das Wortkunstwerk*, 182-206. (Zuerst *GRMon*, VII (1915), 161-77)
- "Roman und Epos," *LE*, XVII (1915), 581-91, 657-66
- "Von erlebter Rede" In *Das Wortkunstwerk*, 207-30 (Zuerst in *Zs f Bucherfreunde*, N F XVI (1924), 17-28)¹
- Wassermann, J "Der hist Roman in Deutschland im Zusammenhang mit E Stücken 'Weissen Gottern,'" *Lit*, XXVI (1923), 3-5
- *Die Kunst der Erzählung* Wien, 1930

¹ Nicht in der *GRMon* wie im *Jahresbericht* angegeben

- Weber, H v "Geschäft und Technik des Unterhaltungsromans," *Zwiebel-fisch*, iv (1915), 161-70
- Wedderkop, H v "Inhalt und Technik des neuen Romans," *Querschnitt*, vii (1927), 423-29
- Wiegand, J "Entwicklung der Erzählungskunst," *ZfdU*, xxxi (1917), 131-54
- Wiegler, P "Formen der Erzählung," *NRs*, xxxvii, i (1926), 621-32.
- "Über heutige Erzählungskunst," *NRs*, xxxiii, ii (1922), 1186-93
- Zolanus *Technik des Romans* Berlin, 1914

B. Einzeluntersuchungen Spezifisch Technisches—Einschlagiges.

- Aulhorn, E "Zur Gestaltung seelischer Vorgänge in neuer Erzählung" In *Vom Geiste neuer Literaturforschung Festschrift für O Walzel* 70-79 Wildpark-Potsdam, 1924
- Barnes, H G "The Functions and Conversations in 'Witiko'" In H. G Fiedler, *German Studies* Oxford, 1938 1-25
- Barnick, E *Gerhard Hauptmanns Erzähltechnik* Diss Frankfurt, 1924 (1925) (Masch)
- Baumann, R *Studien z Erzählungskunst Heinrichs v Kleist Die Gestaltung d episch Scene* (Diss Hamburg) Hamburg, 1928
- Berend, E "Die Technik d 'Darstellung' in der Erzählung," *GRMon*, xiv (1926), 222-33
- "Noch einmal, Die Technik der 'Darstellung' in der Erzählung," *GRMon*, xvi (1928), 248-51
- Bergmann, K "Die Bildersprache unserer zeitgenöss. Erzähler," *WestMh*, Jg 65 (1921), 488-92
- Beyer, P *Die Mittel d Charakteristik in G Kellers 'Grünem Heinrich'* Diss Leipzig, 1925 (Masch)
- Bortzler, F "Weltgefühl u Romanhandlung bei W Raabe," *ZfDkde*, xlvii (1932), 554-60
- Breuer "Zur Charakterdarstellung in O Ludwigs 'Zwischen Himmel und Erde,'" *ThurMBll*, xxxix, 4 (1931)
- Bruns, Th *Peter Rosegger Unters u seine Erzählungstechnik* (Diss Münster) Emsdetten, 1930
- Buhler, Ch "Motivgruppen im Massenroman," *Hochwacht*, ix (1920), 173.
- Dargel, F. A *Die Landschaftsschilderung in d erzähl Dichtg Goethes, Holderlins u d. älteren Romantik*, Diss Heidelberg, 1921 (Masch)
- Droege, A *Die Technik in G Frenssens Romanen* (Diss Greifswald) Greifswald, 1915
- Dym, S *Wassermanns Erzählungskunst* Diss. Wien, 1934
- Ehrentreich, A "Der Aufbau in Raabes 'Schwarzer Galeere,'" *ZfdB*, xiv (1938), 392-94
- Erlacher, L *Unters. z Romantechnik Th Manns* (Diss Basel) Liestal, 1932
- Friedemann, K. *Die Rolle d. Erzählers in d Epik (UNSpLG, N F, vii)*. Leipzig, 1910

- Gilbert, M. E. *Das Gespräch in Fontanes Gesellschaftsroman* (Palaestra 174) Leipzig, 1930
- Grote, G. *Die Erzählungskunst R. Huchs u. ihr Verhältnis z. Erzählungskunst d. 19. Jahrh.* (German Stud. 102) Berlin, 1931
- Gubisch, W. *Unters. z. Erzählkunst Clara Viebigs* Unt. des Berucks d. Heimatort. Diss. Münster, 1926 (Masch.)
- Hackermann, R. *Die Anfänge des Romans in der Zeitung* (Diss. Berlin) Berlin, 1938
- Henz, R. *Die Landschaftsdarstellung bei Jean Paul* Wien, 1924
- Hess, E. H. "Die Einführung der Personen in der Erzählung," *LE*, XXIII (1921), 1358-66
- Hossfeld, H. *Die Kunst d. Erzählung bei L. v. François*. Diss. Jena, 1922 (Masch.)
- Hotes, L. *Das Leitmotiv in d. neueren dt. Romandichtung* (Diss. Frankfurt) Buckeburg, 1931
- Howard, W. G. "Über die Technik d. Charakterschilderung bei G. Keller," *GR*, IX (1932), 239-57
- Iwanowa, G. *Roman- u. Novellentechnik bei Sudermann* Diss. München, 1925. (Masch.)
- Jacob, P. *Die novellistische Einlage im deutschen Prosaroman u. ihre ausländ. Vorbilder* Diss. Berlin, 1921 (Masch.)
- Jacobstroer, B. *Die Romantechnik bei Fr. Gerstaecker* (Diss. Greifswald) Greifswald, 1914
- Jensen, W. J. H. *Fehrs' Erzählungstechnik im Roman 'Maren' u. d. grosseren Novellen* Diss. Hamburg, 1923 (1925) (Masch.)
- Junge, H. *Wilhelm Raabe Studien u. Inhalt u. Form seiner Werke*. (SchrLitGesBonn, IX) Dortmund, 1910.
- Kricker, G. *Theodor Fontane Von seiner Art u. episch. Technik* (SchrLitGesBonn, N F IV). Berlin, 1912.
- Krockel, J. *Das Kompositionsgesetz in d. Romanen d. Enrico v. Handel-Mazzetti*. Diss. Frankfurt, 1927. (Masch.)
- Landshoff, F. *Th. Fontanes 'Effi Briest', die Kunstform eines Romans*. Diss. Frankfurt, 1926 (Masch.)
- Lauschus, L. *Über Technik und Stil der Romane und Novellen Immermanns*. (SchrLitGesBonn, N F VI) Berlin, 1913.
- Lawson, M. *Spannung in der Erzählung* Bonn, 1934
- Leib, F. *Erzählungseingänge in der deutschen Literatur* (Diss. Giessen) Mainz, 1913.
- Lettig, L. *Wilhelm Raabes Erzählungstechnik und seine Abhängigkeit von literarischen Vorbildern* Diss. Graz, 1921
- Loderhose, K. E. *Die Landschaftsgestaltung in H. Lons Prosawerken*. (Diss. Frankfurt) Berlin, 1930.
- Machleidt, W. *Die Naturschilderungen bei H. Lons* Diss. Hamburg, 1923 (1925) (Masch.)
- Matthey, A. *Über die Kunst des Gestaltens in d. erzähl. Dichtg. Jakob Schaffners* (Diss. Marburg) Kempen-Rh., 1934

- Matthey, A *Die hist Erzählungen des Carl Franz van der Velde* Kap B 'Veldes Erzählungstechnik' (*Tüb German Arbeiten* IV) Stuttgart, 1928
- Mittelbach, W *Die Rolle des Erzählers bei G Keller* Diss Rostock, 1923 (Masch)
- Morisse, A M *Die epische Kunst und Kunsttechnik E v Wildenbruchs* (Diss Bonn) Bonn, 1912
- Muhlbacher, G *Die Komposition der Romantrilogie Wilh Raabes* Diss Graz, 1921
- Müller, G *Quellen und Technik der Freytagschen 'Bruder vom deutschen Hause'* Diss Tübingen, 1921 (1922) (Masch)
- Neuburger, P *Die Versenlage in der Prosadichtung der Romantik* (*Palaestra* 145) Leipzig, 1924
- Otto, K *Wielands Romantechnik* Diss Kiel, 1922 (Masch)
- Paul, A *Der Einfluss W Scotts auf die epische Technik Th Fontanes* (*Sprache u Kultur d german u roman Völker* B, x) Breslau, 1934
- Peacock, R *Das Leitmotiv bei Th Mann* (Diss Marburg) (*Sprache u Dichtg*, LV) Bern, 1934
- Peter, H A *Th Mann und seine epische Charakterisierungskunst* (Diss Bern) (*Sprache u Dichtg*, XLIII) Bern, 1929
- Petsch, R "Der epische Dialog," *Euph*, XXXII (1931), 187-205
 ——— "Die Versenlage im Roman," *NJbbfWJ*, I (1925), 365-76.
- Prieger, M *Hewrich Zschokkes Erzählungskunst*. Diss München, 1924 (Masch)
- Rhabana, Schwester Ursuline (Münkel, Th). *Die archaisierenden Stilmittel der Erzählkunst der Frau Enrica Handel-Mazzetti* (Diss Frankfurt) Kempten, 1929 (1931)
- Riess, E *Wilh Heines Romantechnik* (FNDLG, XXXIX) Weimar, 1911.
- Rost, W E *Örtlichkeit und Schauplatz in Fontanes Werken*. (Diss Berlin) (*German u Deutsch*, VI). Berlin, 1930
- Rummelt, F A H Lafontaine v. d Anfängen bis z Höhe seines Schaffens 1785 bis 1800 *Ein Beitr z Gesch. u Technik d Romans* (Diss Halle) Halle/Saale, 1914
- Sarter, E *Zur Technik von Wilh Meisters Wanderjahren*. (*SchrLitGes-Bonn*, N F VII). Berlin, 1914.
- Schaeffer, A "Die Technik der 'Darstellung' in der Erzählung," *GRMon*, xv (1927), 13-18
 ———. "Ein Kommentar zum Helianth," *PrJbb*, 196 (1924), 17-40
- Scheffer, H. "Die Geste im Roman," *Lat*, XXXIII (1930), 71-73
- Scheidt, E *Unters z Technik d. Komischen u z Humor bei J Paul v. d. Gronland Prozessen bis z Titan*. Diss Heidelberg, 1923 (Masch)
- Scheller, W. "Rudolf Huchs deutsche Erzählkunst," *Köln Ztg*, 49/50 (1937)
- Schierding, H. *Unters. u. d. Romantechnik Fr Spielhagens* (Diss Münster) Borna-Leipzig, 1914
- Schneider, H. *Wilh Raabes Mittel der episch Darstellung*. (Diss. München) (*German Stud.*, 178). Berlin, 1936.

- Schroder, H. *Die Charakterzeichnung in Raabes 'Schudderump'* Diss. Marburg, 1919 (Gedr. in *Wiss. Beil. z. Jahresber. u. d. Schuljahr 1920/21 d. Gymnasiums Adolfinum in Buckeburg*)
- Schwarzbeck, K. *Die dicht. Entwicklung Timm Krogers u. seine Erzählungstechnik* (Diss. Münster) Münster, 1929
- Spanjer, G. "Die Darstellung der Landschaft in d. Dichtungen G. Frensen's," *Niederdt. Welt*, XI (1936), 370-73
- Spiero, H. "Motivwanderungen u. Motivwandlungen im neuen deutschen Roman," *GRMon*, IV (1912), 305-21
- Sprengler, J. "Vom epischen Schaffen Weinrichs," *GraL*, XXX, 7 (1936).
- Stapelfeldt, K. *Beiträge z. Wilh. Poecks Romantechnik mit bes. Berücksichtigung d. Niederdeutschen* Diss. Hamburg, 1923 (Masch.)
- Stockum, Th. C. *Wilh. Raabes 'Schudderump' Komposition u. Gehalt* Groningen, 1930
- Stockle, F. K. E. *Jean Pauls Romantechnik* Diss. München, 1924 (1929) (Masch.)
- Stradal, M. *Studien z. Motiwgestaltung bei E. T. A. Hoffmann* (Diss. Breslau) Borna-Leipzig, 1928
- Stresau, H. "Raum u. Zeit in der Epik," *NRs*, XLVI, 1 (1935), 551-59
- Suskind, W. E. "Von der Kunst des Anfangs in der Erzählung," *Frankf. Ztg.*, Nr. 658 (1936)
- Tau, M. *Der assoziative Faktor in der Landschafts- u. Ortsdarstellung Theodor Fontanes* (*Epische Gestaltung*, Bd. 1) Oldenburg, 1928
- Volk, R. *Die Kunstform des 'Maler Nolten' von E. Morike* (Diss. München) (*German. Stud.* LXXXII) Berlin, 1930
- Waffenschmidt, H. *Symbolische Kunst in den Romanen Th. Fontanes* (Diss. Frankfurt) Gelnhausen, 1932.
- Walzel, O. *Ricarda Huch. Ein Wort u. d. Kunst des Erzählens.* Leipzig, 1911
- "Von C. F. Meyers Erzählungskunst" *Bund* (Bern), VI (1925), 323-25
- Weber, H. v. "Geschäft u. Technik des Unterhaltungsromanes," *Zwiebelfisch*, IV (1915), 161-70
- Wehler, E. *Die epische Darstellung in H. Laubes Romantrilogie 'Der Deutsche Krieg'* Diss. Hamburg, 1928.
- Winkler, Chr. "Erzählerhaltung und Anteilnahme," *ZfdB*, VIII (1932), 548-56
- Witkowski, G. "Die Rolle des Erzählers," *Voss Ztg.*, Beil. N. 42 (1912)
- Wittmer, F. "Leitmotive u. thematische Gestaltung in den Heimatromanen F. Schnacks," *GR*, IV (1929), 260-76
- Wittner, V. "Der Standpunkt des neuen Erzählers," *LE*, XXXIII (1920), 141-44
- Wohlfahrt, P. "Die Technik der Romanemgänge, zugleich ein Beitr. z. Romantechnik Dostojewskis," *GraL*, XVI (1922), 147-52

- Burgisser, H *Johann Peter Hebel als Erzähler* (Diss Zurich) (*Wege zur Dichtung* Bd VII) Horgen, 1929
- Diefenbach, M "Der Erzähler Paul Ernst," *Hochl*, xxx (1933), 272-77
- Everth, E "C F Meyers epischer Sprachstil" *ZÄsth*, xx (1926), 129-40
- Feise, E "Stilverwirrung in Sudermanns 'Fiau Sorge,'" *GR*, v (1930), 225-37
- Findelsen, K A "Der Brief in den Werken v Wilh Raabes zweiter Periode," *Eckart*, ix (1915), 580-94, 635-47
- Freytag, H *Wilh Raabes Erzählung 'Meister Autor'* (Diss Jena) Halle/Saale, 1931
- Geiger, A "Die Landschaft u d moderne Roman," *LE*, xvi (1914), 1165-68
- Gunther, J "Gerhard Hauptmann als Erzähler," *Darmst Tgbl*, 23 /11 (1935)
- Harbeck, H "R Schaukals Epik," *Hamb Nachrr Beil*, N 12 /3 (1914)
- Hartung, H *Friedrich Huchs episch Stil* (Diss Munchen) Gutersloh Westf, 1929
- Haug, G "Graf Kaiserling, der Erzähler," *DSchLit*, xxiii (1922), 305-310.
- Heitmann, F *Annette v Droste-Hulshoff als Erzählern Realismus und Objektivität in der Judenbuche* Munster, 1914
- Held, H G "L Thoma als Erzähler," *KritRs*, I, Nr 3 (1913)
- Hofmannsthal, H v *Über Charaktere im Roman u im Drama* Darmstadt, 1927
- Hoppenheit, R "Der Erzähler Hermann Sudermann," *PolitWschr*, vi (1930), 1072-76
- Huebner, F M "Der Epiker Wilh Seidel," *Zeitgeist*, Nr 3 (1914).
- Karsten, O "Der Erzähler Robert Seitz," *Lit*, xL (1938), 15 f
- Kemmerich, G *Paul Heyse als Romanschriftsteller*. (*Forsch z Lit-, Theater- u Zeitungswiss*, v) Oldenburg, 1928
- Klatt, E "Molo, von Scott über Fontane zu Beitr z Stil- u Stoffgesch d deutschen Romans," *LE*, xxiii (1921), 515-19
- Krause, H *Wilh v Polenz als Erzähler* Diss Munchen, 1937 (Masch)
- Kuhn, J *Stifter als Erzähler*. Kassel-Wilhelmshöhe, 1932.
- Marx, M "Anzengruber, der Erzähler u Dramatiker," *Volksspielkunst*, vi (1925), 35-37
- Petersen, J *Fontanes erster Berliner Gesellschaftsroman* Berlin, 1929
- Pfister, K "Wilh Jensen, ein Meister der histor Erzählung," *Stuttig N. Tgbl*, N 75
- Quelle, Ch. *Christian Heimb. Spiess als Erzähler* Diss Leipzig, 1925 (Masch)
- Richter, H *Unters z Stil Wilh. Raabes* (Diss Greifswald) Stettin, 1935
- Saltzwedel, E-W. *Herm Lons als Erzähler, eine stilkrit Untersuchung* (Diss Munchen) Hannover, 1930
- Schluter, E "John Brinckman als Gestalter. Betracht z 'Anno Toback,'" *MecklMh*, ix (1933), 129-31
- Schmidt, J. "Der Erzähler Barthold Blunck," *Nord Rs*, Nr 69 (1936)
- Schott, G "Der Erzähler Wilh Raabe" *Bund* (Bern), xii (1931)

- Stapel, Wilh "Emil Strauss als Erzähler," *DtVt*, Jg 1935, 931-35
- Steckner, H. *Der epische Stil von 'Hermann und Dorothea'* Halle, 1927
- Strenger, R. *Die Landschaft in den Romanen u Erzählungen Wilh Raabes* (Diss Freiburg) Muhlheim, 1934
- Suskind, W E "Grosse Welt in der Erzählung," *Lit*, XL (1938), 197-201
- Tavel, R v "Aus der Werkstatt des Erzählers," *Garbe* (Schweiz Familien-bl., Basel), XX (1936), 146-50
- Trieb, H E *Joseph Ruederer als Erzähler* (Diss München) Coburg, 1929
- Walzel, O. "Eichendorffs Erzählen," *Der Oberschlesier*, XVII (1936), 648-52
- Weede, E. *Die Landschaft bei Willibald Alexis* (Diss Rostock) Lippstadt 1 Westf., 1931.
- Wenger, E *Theodor Fontane. Sprache u Stil in seinen modernen Romanen* (Diss Greifswald) Greifswald, 1913

JOHN R. FREY

University of Illinois

HANS WINTER'S *BERICHT VON DER KUNST DES MEISTERGESANGS*

According to several rule-books of Meistergesang, the singer in the rites known as *Freiung* and *Bewahren der Tone* was to demonstrate, in an oral examination, his familiarity with the history, rules, and the important Tone of Meistergesang.¹ In 1625 Hans Winter, a Nuremberg Meistersinger, wrote a brief description of this part of Meistersinger ritual in the form of a model examination, beginning *Ein kurtz gefaster bericht von der Alten und lobhchen kunst des teutschen meister gesangs*. Since little is known of the ritual of the later Meistersinger, and the only other published document on this theme varies greatly, I print the text.² The manuscript in which this treatise is found, *Cod. germ.* 4° 329

¹E Mummenhoff, "Die Singschulordnung vom Jahre 1616-35 und die Singstätten der Nurnberger Meistersinger," in A L Stiefel (ed.), *Hans Sachs-Forschungen, Festschrift zur vierhundersten Geburtsfeier des Dichters* (Nuremberg, 1894), pp 306-08, J H Haszlein, "Abhandlung von den Meister-Sangern," *Bragur*, III (1894), 95. The minutes of meetings at Iglau in 1613 show that this examining of candidates for certain honors was a common procedure, see F Streinz, *Urkunden der Iglauer Meistersinger*, I (Vienna, 1902), 10-17, II (Vienna, 1907), 35-44.

²I am greatly indebted to Dr John Th Honti and the officials of the Hungarian National Museum for assistance in procuring a photostatic copy of the *Bericht*. This copy is in the Rare Book Room of the University of Chicago.

in Budapest, contains on its 232 pages German poems, songs, and folksongs, chiefly of Nuremberg origin.³

In the custom called *Bewahren der Tone*, the inventor of a new Ton sang it three times for the approval of the assembled singers, these then decided if it merited being recorded as *meisterlich*. This custom is mentioned in the oldest rule-book in existence, the *Nuremberg Schulzettel* of 1540.⁴ On the other hand the custom of *Freyung*, which was probably taken over from the ritual of the guilds, became part of the Meistersinger ritual in the latter half of the century.⁵ According to the account of the historian Wagenseil in 1697, the singer in this ritual was officially elevated to the rank of Meister.⁶ In other rule-books, and in Hans Winter's *Bericht*, the significance of *Freyung* is not always clear. Young and inexperienced singers, as well as accomplished *Meister*, were eligible to receive the honor. The candidate promised to remain faithful to the rules of his art, and was invested with certain rights and privileges,⁷ one of which may have been the right to expect aid from local singers while traveling.⁸

Winter's *Bericht* contains only the preliminary address of the candidate to the *Merker*, and a series of questions and answers. Similar in arrangement is Ambrosius Metzger's *Meisterliche Freyung der Singer*,⁹ which describes the entire rite in the metres of Meisterlieder. Metzger's *Freyung* and the explanatory prose text which accompanies it seem to have been widely accepted, for they

³ A. Hartmann, *Deutsche Meisterliederhandschriften in Ungarn. ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Meistersanges* (Munich, 1894), pp. 3-4, 60. This is one of several MSS which the Hungarian National Museum acquired in 1836 from the antiquarian Nicolaus Jankovich von Jeszenicze. They probably came from the library of Hieronymus Ebner von Eschenbach which was dispersed in 1813-20.

⁴ W. Nagel, *Studien zur Geschichte der Meistersinger* ("Musikalisches Magazin," xxvii, Langensalza, 1909), pp. 53-62.

⁵ O. Plate, "Die Kunstaendrucke der Meistersinger," *Strassburger Studien*, III (1888), p. 169; K. Mey, *Der Meistersang in Geschichte und Kunst* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 100.

⁶ J. C. Wagenseil, *De civitate Noribergensi commentatio* (Altdorf, 1697), p. 547; Nagel, p. 81; Mey, pp. 100-01.

⁷ Stiefel, pp. 307-8; Streinz, II, 36-40; F. Streinz, "Der Meistersang in Mahren," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, XIX (1894), 253-255.

⁸ Hätzlein, *Bragur*, III, 95.

⁹ Wagenseil, pp. 548-554; Mey, pp. 110-18.

are found in *Cod germ.* 329 just preceding our text, and in *Cod. germ.* 29, another MS in Budapest. From these or from a similar source Wagenseil took the text for his *Commentatio*.¹⁰ The difference between Metzger's *Freyung* and Winter's *Bericht* is striking. Both deal with the origin of Meistergesang, and the reason why the candidate seeks to be *gefreyet* (he already has the privileges of a singer), but the answers to these questions are utterly unlike. Metzger, a learned man, shows a thorough familiarity with such things as the four *gekronte Tone*, the traditional history of Meistergesang, and the seven liberal arts. Winter's matter-of-fact catechization, with its vague references to *musica*, and its emphasis on the religious importance of Meistergesang, seems almost devoid of learning. And yet it was Winter whom Metzger gratefully acknowledged as his teacher in the art of Meistergesang.

Winter is exceedingly interesting for the part he played in the controversies of the Nuremberg Meistersinger in 1624.¹¹ Although the exact circumstances of the quarrel are obscure, it seems clear from the official documents in the case that a group of younger Meistersinger, led by Hans Winter, attempted to introduce a new *Tabulatur*. Both sides claimed to be faithful to the rules left by Hans Sachs, but the younger men emphasized also what they termed *die rechte Kunst*. The elders resisted these efforts, and excluded them from participation in the *Singschule*; the latter in turn organized their own society, which flourished and soon threatened to overshadow the older school. The controversy finally was settled by municipal decree; the younger men were to regain their rights in the old society, but had to abide by the rules of Hans Sachs. It was a victory for the elders.

Undoubtedly the struggle here, as in Augsburg several years before, concerned the introduction of accentual versification. Martin Opitz's *Buch von der deutschen Poeterey* appeared in 1624, but the Meistersinger had been troubled by the new type of verse much earlier.¹² In an autobiographical poem of 1629, Ambrosius Metz-

¹⁰ See Hartmann, pp 104-6. Wagenseil knows nothing of the prose text (Hartmann, pp 105-6) which describes the giving of the garland, he has only a few verses devoted to this subject.

¹¹ K. Barack, "Zur Geschichte der Meistersänger in Nürnberg," *Zeitschrift für deutsche Kulturkunde*, iv (1859), 376-390, Nagel, pp 95 ff.

¹² See A. Taylor, *The Literary History of Meistergesang* (New York, 1937), pp 32-33.

ger admitted defeat in the struggle to introduce Opitz's rules, and new subjects and styles of treatment, into *Meistergesang*¹³ This stubborn and successful refusal to bow to the demands of a new age spelled the death of *Meistergesang* in Nuremberg. Winter's *Bericht* was written one year after his bitter defeat Ten years later saw the final codification of the rules—one of the last signs of life among the Nuremberg *Meistersinger*.

The text of Hans Winter's *Bericht* follows, it is incomplete, breaking off at the end of the sixth question. The handwriting is seventeenth-century Gothic cursive. The scribe apparently wrote hastily or carelessly, for there are many inconsistencies in spelling. Frequently *a* cannot be distinguished from *o*. I transcribe *literatim et verbatim*, abbreviations in the original have been resolved. The pages of the MS are not numbered

Ein kurtz gefaster bericht von der Alten und loblichen kunst deß teutschen meister gesangs waß daß Selbige sey und waß ein singer und auch viel mehr einer der sich in diser adlen kunst will freyen lassen der schon gefreyet und abprobt ist wissen und konen soll frag und antword weiß als ein Examen gestellt sehr nuzlich und dienstbarreit zu gebrauchen deß gleichen So ein singer einen thon Componiret hat und willeg ist den Selbigen vor der geseelschaft ordentlich zu bewerren wie er solches der Geseelschaft vor drogen und sich Sonsten der bey zu verhalten hat und waß im darbey noch ferner zu wissen geburen thut gestell[t] durch herrn Johan [MS p 2] winter burger und Messerschmit wie auch ein gefreyter singer und mercker deß Teutschen meister gesangs alhier in Nurnberg 1625 so ein Singer sich in der kunst deß meister gesangs wil freyen lassen so Solter solches eine Geraume Zeit zu vor denen herren merkern im bey sein der andern Singer anzeigen fast auf solche / weiß und art

meine gunstige herrn merker und Singer Es haben die alden weisen herten pflegen zu Sagen die natur habe zwar nichts an den menschen vergessen allein daß sie nur nicht habe ein fenster in die seiten gesetzt dadurch man sehen mochte waß doch der mensch in den hertzen hete solches aber mochte man Alhier von meiner person auch wol Sprechen seitenmal ich eine Zeit hero etwoß in hertzen habe verborgen gedragen und imer gewünschet habe deßen von Gott mit einer lebentigen stim und Sprach begabet bin so wil ich vermittelst desen vor einer Ehrlebllichen gesellschaft die gedanken meineß hertzens er offnen ist dero wegen an die herren mercker und Singern dieses mein begern daß da ich nemlich etwon eine Zeit hero mit der Ehr und hochstloblichen gesellschaft gesungen und darmit die sing schullen haben bauen helffen so hat mir Je und alle Zeit hertzlich wollgefall[e]n der lobliche gradu der geffreiten Singer daß ich also teglich bey

¹³ F. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, "Zwei neue Meistersangerhandschriften," *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, III (1874), 54-62

mir bedrachtet habe wie ich daß Eetle Bandt der freyheit auch wol erlangen mochte und ein gefreyter singer sein darum so ist nun an euch alle zu mall mein vnterthenige biet mir so viel Zeit und stadt zu vergunstigen dar mit ich auch z Solcher freyheit gelangen mechte wo ich von der leblichen geseelschoft erlaubnuß hete so wolte ich mich lösen verhoeren und probiren nach alt her gekomen gebrauch und gewarde hiermit eine gutige antword

Die eiste frage

[MS p 3] auß waß vrsachen aber wold ir euch freyen lossen seit ir doch vor hin in der geseelschaft der meistersinger¹⁴ n habt zu noch ferner mit vnß singen wor zu bedarft ir dan die freyheit Antwort

darum auff daß ich mich in meinen gemutte deßen gedrosten kan daß ich er wehlet und bestetiget bin die kunst helffen zu befordern und daß ich solches zu thun schultig und ver bunden bin die Andre frog

Ja will einer ein meister sein so muß er Etwoß können es ist nicht genug daß man sagt ich bin ein gefreyter singer es geheret mehr dar zu getraut ir euch den meisterlichen Singstull mit rechter kunst und verstandt zu besiezen anwort

eben auß diesen vrsachen will ich mich lossen virstellen und freyen dar ich gebrobret werde ob ich der meisterschaft wurdig sey oder nicht / anwort

die dritte frage

wan ir nun wold ein gefreyter meister singer Sein so must ir vor allen Dingen wissen waß daß meister gesang sey und worauß daß meister gesang sey genomen worden Antwort

Daß meister gesang ist freilich ohne zweiffel erstlich auß der Alden kunst der musieca her vor komen dan in und aussen ist es ein stuck der musieca aber von wegen daß es die unkunst thut auß fleißen und nur allein der rechten meisterlichen kunst begeret so wird es daß meister gesang genand die 4

frage

warum und zu waß end ist aber daß meister gesang erdocht worden und wor zu kan man es mit guten nutzen treiben und gebrauchen / anwort

fir nemlich und vor allen dingen so ist es erdacht worden gott dem Allmechtigen dardurch zu leben und Spreisen sein gottliches word dardurch auß zu breiten und der gemein fir zu dragen

[MS p 4] zum Andern vnß zu einem Spiegel und vorbielt dan dordurch sehen wir wie es in allen historien in der ganzen weld je und alle Zeit eingangen ist darauß daß lob und glück der fromen der schandt schmach und vngluck der bos zu erkenen ist

zum driten vnß zu vbung dar durch zu lerren recht verstendlich bey den leiden zu Singen und zu reden dor gegen aber durch diese vbung aller handt Eitele leicht fertigkeit zu vermeiden die funft frage

ir wiß[t] aber daß vnser kunst fir nemlich besteht in den gedichten

¹⁴ In the text, this is *meisterschaft*, but the *schaft* is crossed out, above it and to the right is written *meisterschaft singer*, and in this *schaft* is also crossed out.

melodiyen oder meister thonen nun sind in vnseier kunst der Selbigen meister thone ein Grosse an zahl und sold ein Jeder Singer zimlich viel kenen und zum vbeifluß die weil ir wold ein gefreyter werden so miß[t] ir dreftlich wol in der Selben er faren sein in allerley gemeßen als vber kurz und vbei lang und ohne welche ir nicht kont ein rechter Gefieyter meister singer sein getraud ir euch nun mit guter an zol vor der gesellschaft zu bestehen / Antwort

so ich nicht vber kurz und vber lang konte der gleichen so ich sonß[t] in allerley gemeßen nicht mit zimlicher anzol ver fast were so wolde ich mich nicht vnder standen haben ein gefieder singer zu werden dan ich weiß Ja daß keiner nicht kan gefreyt werden er Sie dan mit einer guten an zoll thon und liedern ver fast sey will mich ehr lobliche gesellschaft darinen Examiniren so bin ich er bietig eine und Thon und weisen von mir sampt deren liedern von mir heren zu loßen

die Sechs[t]e frage

wan ir nun mit einer suma von thon und liedern ver faset seit Ja auch in allerley gemessen und Zohlen der Selbigen so werdet ir ia wo es die not er forderte und es einer geseelschaft gefelig were geristet sein einen andern singer mit gesang zu entsetzen und zu verdreten

antwort

CARL KLITZKE

University of Minnesota

DER STACHEL DER LIEBE

AN EARLY FIFTEENTH-CENTURY GERMAN MANUSCRIPT

The Rush Rhees Library of the University of Rochester possesses a German MS, a gift of Mr. Hiram W. Sibley. The MS, in North-Bavarian dialect, was written at Nuremberg in the early fifteenth century and sent from there to the Dominican nunnery of Medingen, near Donauworth, in Bavaria.

fol 177v "Diß puch gehort in daz closter zu medingen prediger ordens und ist dar geschickt worden von Nurnberg der swester kungunt zechern "

The MS is on paper, 20.5 x 14 cm, with two columns on each page and between 21 and 27 lines to a column. There are ruled lines for the margin. The writing is in three different hands. The second hand, starting on fol 17rb, is more cursive and with letters more pointed than the first, the third hand, beginning on fol. 167, resembles more the first. The colophon entry just quoted is in a

fourth hand, probably that of the librarian. The book is made up of 15 sections of 12 leaves each. The first leaf of the first section, however, is missing, it must have been an empty and unfoliated flyleaf. The remaining 179 leaves are foliated in red ink from 1 to 178, two consecutive leaves being foliated 11 and xi respectively. Fol. 178 is a blank-leaf. At the beginning of most sections a number appears in the upper right-hand corner, in some cases partly cut away. In the center of some sections reinforcing paper strips are inserted with fragments of German writing on them. The leather-board binding is contemporary, with five metal bosses on each side and clasp.

Pasted inside the front cover is a colored woodcut, 12.5 x 9 cm, representing the death of the Virgin Mary. St. Peter is standing behind the bed in the upper right hand corner, holding the pillow. Next to him Christ is standing with the soul of the Virgin in the shape of a nude infant. The virgin herself is shown kneeling in front of the bed, supported by St. John. The date of the woodcut is probably 1420-30, and the place of origin may be Nuremberg. Neither this cut nor an impression from the same block has apparently been published.¹

Pasted on the same cover, underneath the woodcut, is a strip of vellum with the librarian's entry "Diß puch gehort in daz clofter zu medingen prediger ordens."

The MS begins:

fol 1 "Daz puch nicht mag unbliehen² genant werden der stachel der liebe in den fuften und gutigften³ heiren Cristi Jhesu unfer heillant und wirt geteilt in drew teil "

Then a short synopsis is given and a table of contents for all three parts, the second and third part, however, are preceded by a repetition, with slight variations in word-order, of the table of contents for part two and three, respectively (fol. 63v-64, 117-117v).

This German MS, *Der Stachel der Liebe*, turns out to be a faithful translation of the Latin *Stimulus Amoris*, a thirteenth-century

¹ For the date and attribution of the woodcut I am indebted to Professor Erwin Panofsky, the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies, and to Professor M. Weinberger, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University

² unbliehen *the more normal Bavarian form would have been unpilichen*

³ der stachel . . gutigften *underlined, but by a later hand.*

mystical treatise which Sbaralea⁴ ascribes to a certain Jacobus of Milan whose work was later enlarged and rearranged in three parts and included amongst the "opera supposititia" of St Bonaventura.⁵ A part of this larger version also appears, under the title "Instructio quomodo homo possit in bono proficere et placere Deo," amongst the "opera supposititia of St. Bernard."⁶

For the Latin original, or a version belonging to the same group as the one from which the German translation was made, one probably would have to look amongst the Latin manuscripts in Bohemian and Bavarian libraries. A comparison with the Latin text as published in the Paris edition of St Bonaventura's works reveals some important differences: first, the German version is shorter, it leaves out several chapters, shortens others, and occasionally combines two chapters into one so that the numbers of the German chapters do not correspond with the number of the Latin version,⁷ second, the Latin chapter II, 14 is combined with the second prologue (alius prologus sive oratio: "Transfige, dulcissime . . .") to form the German chapter II, 12; third the same second prologue appears again, in a different German translation, at the end of the second part as chapter II, 16, fourth, the Latin chapter II, 13 ("Accipe, frater . . ."), which had been omitted in its proper place, appears as III, 18, the last chapter of the German version.

The teaching of the *Stimulus* is, briefly, that three things are necessary in order to attain the repose of contemplation: first, consideration of one's own faults and shortcomings, second, detachment from everything that is not God, third, bearing Christ in

⁴ J H Sbaralea, *Supplementum et castigatio ad scriptores trium ordinum S. Francisci a Waddingo aliisque descriptos* Ed nova, pars II, Romae MCMXXI (Bibliotheca historico-bibliographica III), p 13

⁵ *S Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, Parisius, 1868, XII, 631-703—On the question of the disputed authorship see the introduction to this edition (p xlv) and C Douais, "De l'auteur du *Stimulus Amoris* publié parmi les *Opusculs* de Saint Bonaventure" in *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne*, nouvelle série, XI (1884-85), 361-373, 457-470

⁶ Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus completus*, 184, col 1171 sqq.

⁷ Furthermore, in the marking of the chapters in the text itself as well as in the folio numbers entered opposite each chapter in the table of contents, some confusion has arisen in chapter I, 8 (German numbering, i e the chapter beginning "In den Erbern leiden ") The enumeration of different "gradus" has, from the third gradus on, been mistaken for the beginnings of new chapters

one's heart and feeling compassion for His sufferings.⁸ Obviously the *Stimulus* is influenced by the doctrines of St. Bonaventura and by the gentle mysticism and by the devotion to the Passion of Christ which St. Bernard inaugurated in his sermons on the Song of Songs.

Quid enim tam efficax curanda conscientiae vulnera, nec non purgandam mentis aciem, quam Christi vulnerum sedula meditatio?⁹

In this connection it is interesting that the Rochester MS belonged to the nunnery of Medingen, for to Medingen came in her twentieth year Margarete Ebner (1291-1351), friend of Heinrich von Nördlingen and one of the foremost German woman mystics; and all through the fourteenth century Medingen remained a center of mysticism.¹⁰

The *Stimulus* was very popular and widely known in its day as can be seen from the many manuscripts, translations, and early prints.¹¹ A French translation has been attributed to Jean Gerson, "doctor christianissimus" and chancellor of the University of Paris.¹² A fourteenth-century German translation must be ascribed to not less eminent and important a translator, namely to Johann von Neumarkt, chancellor to Emperor Charles IV. Through the researches of Konrad Burdach and his disciples the importance of Johann and his Bohemian circle for the history of German language, literature, and learning has been brought to light.¹³ It was Charles IV who founded the first German university at Prague in 1348, and Johann is outstanding alike as translator into German, as inter-

⁸ Auguste Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu, et les moyens d'y arriver d'après les grands maîtres de la spiritualité*, Paris, 1921, pp 199-200

⁹ Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus completus*, 183, col 1079

¹⁰ See the article "Maria-Modingen" in *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, ed Michael Buchberger, II (Freiburg i B, 1912), 831—Cp also Hieronymus Wilms, *Geschichte der deutschen Dominikanerinnen, 1206-1916*, Dülmen i W, 1920, and L Zoepf, *Die Mystikerin Margarete Ebner* (Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, ed W Goetz, XVI), Leipzig und Berlin, 1914

¹¹ *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, IV (1930), col 488-495 (no 4820-4832, cp also no 4649).

¹² James L Connolly, *John Gerson*, Louvain, 1928 (Université de Louvain, Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres des conférences d'histoire et de philologie, 2me série, 12me fascicule), p 345

¹³ On Johann von Neumarkt see J Klapper in *Die Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters—Verfasserlexikon*, II (Berlin und Leipzig, 1936), 615-620

mediary between Italian and German humanists, and as a pioneer in the unification and standardization of the German language.

Professor J. Klapper who is preparing a definitive edition of Johann's translation of the *Stimulus* for Burdach's *Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation* was good enough to let me have the following information concerning the MSS of Johann's translation ¹⁴

- 1 Gotha, Bibliothek, A 27 contains the complete translation
- 2 Breslau, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, IQ119 contains on fol 25r-77v a selection of 21 chapters from Johann's translation
- 3 Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, IV43N contains on fol 1-40r the same selection of 21 chapters

The 21 chapters contained in the Breslau and Nuremberg MSS have been incorporated in a group of MSS which contain the missing chapters in an independent translation.

- 4 Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Cgm 640
- 5 Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Cgm 790

The Rochester MS belongs to this latter group, it, too, contains 21 chapters in the translation of Johann von Neumarkt and the missing chapters in an independent translation. As a matter of fact, the two translations are so different in style and quality that it probably would be comparatively easy to separate them by the internal evidence of style alone.

Even apart from its possible value in establishing the definitive text of Johann's translation, the Rochester MS should have some points of interest. As far as phonology and morphology are concerned, there is not much that would be exceptional for the date and place of origin. Of orthographical peculiarities there may be mentioned that MHG *uo*, *u*, and *u* all three are written indiscriminately and irrationally either *u* or *u*, the *Umlaut* on *o* does sometimes appear, but inconsistently, both MHG *î* and *ei* are written either *ei*, *ey*, *ai*, or *ay*, MHG *ie* is written mostly as *ie*, but also *ye*, *i*, or *y*. An occasional spelling *ie* for MHG *i* next to *h* or liquids probably represents a Bavarian glide ¹⁵ Bavarian, too, is the occasional darkening of *a* to *o*, two letters not always easy to distinguish

¹⁴ For this information as well as for much other help I here wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor Klapper.

¹⁵ We have, on the other hand, the reverse spelling *i* for MHG *ie* next to *h*, cf. *siche* in the first German excerpt below.

in the MS. Both the Bavarian contraction *trest* and the normal *sagt* can be found in the MS. Orthographical and dialectical criteria do not permit, in my finding, any definite conclusions on the usage of the individual scribe or on that of the *Vorlage* or *Vorlagen*.

Of considerably greater interest than the phonology of the MS is its style, vocabulary, and syntax. Different translations of the same original are a welcome touchstone by which to appraise the style of a translator and that of his time as well as the growing flexibility and adaptability of the German language. The MS itself contains an interesting illustration, for, as has been pointed out above, the second prologue or, as it might better be called, the prayer beginning *Transfige, dulcissime* is included in the MS twice and in two different translations, first as part of chapter II, 12 (fol 105r-106r) and secondly, in the translation of Johann von Neumarkt, as chapter II, 16. These two translations present some interesting material for comparison, and their literal transcription (except for the expansion of abbreviations and the addition of some marks of punctuation) may conclude this short report. I add the Latin version from the Paris edition of St. Bonaventura's works although it cannot be regarded as the original of the German.

Stimulus Amoris

Transfige, dulcissime Jesu, medullas animae meae, suavissimo ac salu berrimo vulnere amoris tui. Vulnere viscera animae meae, vera, et firma, et apostolica charitate ut vere ardeat, langueat et liquefiat anima mea solo semper amore, et desiderio tui. Concupiscat, et deficiat anima mea in atria tua, cupiat dissolvi et esse tecum. Da, ut anima mea te solum semper esuriat, panem vitae coelestis, qui de coelo descendisti, panem angelorum, refectorem animarum sanctarum, panem nostrum quotidianum et super-substantialem, habentem omnem saporem, et omnem dulcorem, et omnem delectamentum suavitatis, in quem desiderant angeli prospicere. Te semper esuriat, te comedat cor meum, et dulcedine saporis tui repleantur viscera animae meae. Te semper sitiatis fontem vitae aeternae, fontem sapientiae, fontem scientiae, fontem aeterni luminis, torrentem voluptatis, et ubertatis domus Dei. Te semper ambiat, te quaerat, te inveniat, ad te tendat, ad te perveniat, te meditetur, de te loquatur, et omnia operetur ad laudem et gloriam nominis tui, cum omni humilitate et discretione, omne dilectione et delectatione, omni facilitate et affectu, omni patientia et pace perfecta, omni longanimitate et perseverantia usque in finem ut tu solus semper sis mihi spes mea, gaudium meum, jucunditas mea, fiducia mea, divitiae meae, dilectio mea, quies mea, tranquillitas mea, dulcedo mea, suavitas mea, cibus meus, refectio mea, tutela mea, sustentatio mea, expectatio mea, refugium meum, auxilium meum, refrigerium meum, patientia mea, protectio mea, responsio mea, locutio mea,

meditatio mea, operatio mea, thesaurus meus, in quo solo fixa et firma, et immobiliter radicata sit semper mens mea, et cor meum Amen

Der Stachel der Liebe (II, 12)

O aller sufter Jhesu Crist! durch stich daz marck meiner sel mit aller-suster und haylbarter wunden deiner lieb, verwunde die eingeweyde meiner sele mit warer reuiger und bewelter lieb daz werlich siche und zu flizze mein sel allein stecz von liebe und begerung dein begere mein selle in dem wonung zu lost (zu last?) werden und sein mit dir allein noch dir / du prot dez himelichen lebens, dei du pist gestigen vom himel, du prott der engel und du speisung der heiligen sellen, du unfer tegliches prot daz do in im hat suffigkeit, allen smack, allen lust der suzzigkeit dich begern an zu sehen die engel stecz hunger und esse mein herze, und mit suzzigkeit deins smacks werden erfullet die eingeweyde meiner selle durste stecz dich prunnen dez lebens, prunnen der weisheit, prunnen der kunst, sunen des ewigen liches, dich flizzendes wasser der wollust, von fruchtperkeit dez hawz gotez beger dein stecz mein herze, suche und vind dich gegen dir und kum zu dir, gedenck dein, rede ich und wurcke alle ding in lob und ere deines namen mit diemutikeit und liebe, mit snellickheit und wurckung, mit gedult, frid und zu nemen, mit bestendikeit piz an daz ende, und du pist stecz mein ganze hoffnung, mein ganz getiawen, mein reichum, mein lieb, mein wunsamkeit, mein freude, mein rwe, mein stillig-keit, mein fride, mein suzzigkeit, mein guter smack, mein speise, mein sterck, mein zu flucht, mein hilf, mein weisheit, mein besetzung, mein schacz in dem und unbeweglich vest und ein gesteckt sey stecz gewurczelt mein selle, mein gedanck und mein hercz Amen

Der Stachel der Liebe (II, 16)

O Du aller-suster Jhesu durchstich daz ynnerst marck meiner sel mit der so gar senften und haylbarn wunden deiner lieb verwunde die ingeweide meiner sel mit der waren ymmer wernden und von uben ob er gesandten lieb, daz mein sell warhaftlich prynne sene suchte und zu lassende werde daz sie allein vor lieb und senung noch dir alle czeit begerend sey und hin vellig daz sie in deinem verale wunschen und entlost werden und mit dir zu sein gib mir daz mein sell hunger noch dir allein, du prott dez himelichen lebens, daz do vom hymel kummen ist, und prott der engel, und speise der heiligen sele, unfer tegliches und uberweisenliches prot, daz do hat alle suzzigkeit der smackhaftikeit mein herze muzz alle czeit hungern und essen dich den die engel begern an zu sehen, und die ingeweid meiner selle mussen erfullet werden mit der suzzigkeit deins smacks mein sel muzz alle czeit dursten und begern dich prunn dez lebens, der weisheit, prunn dez wissens, prunn dez ewigen liches, dich flizz der wollust, dich vollsuzzige fruchtparkheit dez hawses gotez sie muzz alle czeit noch der ¹⁴ getielichen wunschen, dich suchen, dich vinden. sie muz zu dir willen haben und zu dir kommen, dich betrachten, dich reden, und alle

¹⁴ der, in the MS d', is a misreading for dir

ding tun und wucren zu lobe und zu eien deinen namen mit diemutikeit
und mit liebhabung, mit geringmutikeit und mit wurckheher tat, mit
gedult, mit fried, und mit zu nemung, und mit begerung piz an daz ende
und du mußt mir allezeit sein mein hoffnung mit getrawen, mein reichum,
mein liebhabung, mein frewde, mein iwe, mein stilheit, mein iache, mein
fuzzigkeit, mein speife, mein erkuckung, mein zu flucht, mein hillf, mein
gedult, mein smeckende weifheit, mein beficzung, mein schacz in dem mein
gemut und mein hercze alle czeit ftet vefte und unbeweglich fey gewurczelt
und gepfropheet Amen ¹⁷

LUDWIG W. KAHN

The University of Rochester

THE AGE OF ISAAC AT THE TIME OF THE SACRIFICE

The scene of the sacrifice of Isaac has long been regarded as the supreme example of dramatic pathos in the English Cycle plays. The imagination of the playwrights seized upon the situation and enlarged upon the pleas of the young child to his father when informed that he was to be slain. The Brome play is particularly poignant in its representation of Isaac:

Kyll me, fader? a-lasse¹ wat haue I done?
Yff I haue trespassyd a-zens þow owt,
With a ȝard ȝe may make me full myld,
And with þowr scharp sword kyll me nogth
For i-wys, fader, I am but a chyld²

Chester, Towneley and Dublin, though less skilful than Brome, agree in stressing the pathetic figure of the young child Isaac.

In contrast with these four cycles, however, the sacrifice scene in *York* and *Ludus Coventriae* almost wholly lacks pathos by representing Isaac as a man grown. Thus the *York* dramatist says of Isaac:

He is of eelde, to reken right,
Thyrty ȝere and more sum dele³

¹⁷ After this note had been written and set in type, Professor Klapper's edition, referred to in the text, has appeared as vol. VI, part 3 of *Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation* (Berlin, 1939)

¹ O Waterhouse, *Non Cycle Mystery Plays*, EETS Ext. Ser. CIV, p. 42

² Lucy Toulmin Smith, *York Plays*, Play X, lines 81-2.

When told that he is to be sacrificed, he replies

And I sall noght grouche þer agayne
To worke his wille I am wele payed *

Although he admits the weakness of his flesh, his real concern is not for himself but for his father.

I know myself be cours of kynde,
My flessche for dede will be diedande,
I am ferde þat ȝe sall fynde
My force youre forwarde to withstand
Ther-fore is beste þat ȝe me bynde
In bandis faste, boothe fute and hande
Now whillis I am in myght and mynde
So sall ȝe saffele make offerande ⁴

The author of the *Ludus Coventriae* play, though making no explicit statement as to Isaac's age, represents him as voicing mature sentiments:

Almyghty god of his greet mercye
Fful hertyly I thanke þe certayne
At goddys byddynge here for to dye
I obeye me here for to be sclayne.⁵

This difference between the adult Isaac which we find in *York* and *Ludus Coventriae* and the child Isaac of the other cycles we are not justified in explaining as due entirely to the comparatively feeble imagination of these playwrights. There is ample evidence that the tradition of the adult Isaac was well grounded in earlier mediæval narratives. Thus in the *South English Legendary* it is stated in the section on "Old Testament History".

He [Abraham] ros & toke ysaac his sone þo he was of ~~xxx~~ ȝere
And lad him vppon a hille forto sle hym þere.⁶

The paraphrase of Old Testament History in 12-line stanzas preserved in MS. Arch. Selden B 26 likewise pictures Isaac as a grown man at the time of the sacrifice.

The Vulgate uses the word *puer* of Isaac. This might seem decisive against the notion of an adult, but Sir Thomas Browne in

* *Ibid.*, lines 191-2

⁴ *Ibid.*, lines 209 ff

⁵ K S Block, *Ludus Coventriae*, EETS Ext. Ser. cxx, p. 47, lines 145 ff.

⁶ MS. Lambeth 223, fol. 10 b.

his *Vulgar Errors* says that *puer* "should not be strictly apprehended, . . . but respectively unto Abraham, who was at that time six score",⁷ moreover he points to the fact that Isaac was able to carry the wood for the sacrifice as clear evidence that he was full grown.

The prime authority, however, for the tradition of an adult Isaac seems to have been Josephus, who is expressly cited in the text of the thirteenth-century *Genesis and Exodus*.

Iff iosephus ne legeð me	Newe tidng, and selkuð hode.—
ðor quiles he wunede in bersabe,	'Tac ðin sune ysaac in hond,
so was ysaaces eld told	And far wið him to siðhinges lond,
xx and five winter old,	And ðor ðu salt him offren me,
ðo herde abraham steuene fro gode	On an hil ðor ic sal taunen ðe'

The immediate source on which this Middle English narrative depended was Peter Comestor's *Historia Scholastica*, and this likewise refers to Josephus as authority for the age of Isaac.⁸ Turning to the *Antiquities of the Jews* we find that Isaac was twenty-five years old at the time of the sacrifice. When Abraham informed him that he was to be slain, Josephus continues:

Now Isaac was of such a generous disposition as became the son of such a father, and was pleased with his discourse, and said, "That he was not worthy to be born at first, if he should reject the determination of God and of his father, and should not resign himself up readily to both their pleasures; since it would have been unjust if he had not obeyed, even if his father alone had so resolved." So he went immediately to the altar to be sacrificed.¹⁰

Nevertheless, the authority of Josephus on this point was not universally accepted in the Middle Ages. Nicholas de Lyra, the celebrated commentator on the Scriptures, after misquoting Josephus as saying that Isaac was thirty-five years old, proceeds to express his own opinion that at the time of the sacrifice Isaac was still *in puerili etate*.¹¹ That there were conflicting opinions in the Middle Ages is also affirmed by Ginzberg in his *Legends of the Jews*:

⁷ *Vulgar Errors*, Wilkins ed., II, 28

⁸ R. Morris, *Genesis and Exodus*, EETS No 7, p 37, lines 1281-90.

⁹ Migne, *Patrol Lat* cxcviii, col. 1104.

¹⁰ Whiston translation, Bk I, Ch. XIII.

¹¹ *Postilla super Vetus Testamentum*, Genesis xxii

Great emphasis is laid in the sources on the fact that although Isaac, at the time of the Akedah, was no longer a lad, but a grown man (different views are given as to his exact age) yet he willingly submitted to his father's wish. In the Akedah legends two currents are to be distinguished, according to one, Abraham is the hero, while in the other Isaac is glorified.¹²

The evidence shows that the same two currents are in the Middle English versions of the story and that the dramatists of the *York* and *Ludus Coventriae* plays based their conception of the age and attitude of Isaac on sound authorities rather than stumbled into it because they were lacking in dramatic perception. In the narrative versions of the story the difference in point of view is not so important; but in these two plays it is essential to keep in mind that Isaac, not Abraham as the reader is so likely to assume, is the hero.

Even in the Brome play we may have a vestige of the tradition of the adult Isaac in Abraham's insistence on binding Isaac "That thow schuldyst not let [me], my child,"¹³ since a child could hardly offer serious hindrance to the father, moreover the "martyrlike spirit of consecration"¹⁴ shown by the Brome Isaac belongs more naturally to an adult than to a child. Clearly it is important for the readers of the plays dealing with the sacrifice of Isaac to be conversant with both traditions.

MINNIE E. WELLS

Hood College

OLD FRENCH *la* (*laa*), MODERN FRENCH *layette*

The curious words *la* and *laa*, which are not found in Godefroy, occur no less than five times in the 13th century *fabliau*, *Del fol vilain*, of Gautier Le Leu.¹ The bride in the *fabliau* has placed a mouse in a *la*:

¹² v, 249, n. 229

¹³ Waterhouse, *op. cit.*, p. 46, line 246

¹⁴ Margaret Dancy Fort, "The Metres of the Brome and Chester Abraham and Isaac Plays," *PMLA*, xli, 833

¹ Cf. *RR.*, xv (1924), 30 f.

206 Et cele qui assés savoit,
En une *la* qu'ele avoit,
Que ses amis li ot tramise,
A une grande soris mise,

Her husband, upon her request, goes to her house to get it.

275 Le *laa* prent, si s'en retorne

On the way back the mouse is restless:

291 Et li soris pas ne repose
Qui en le *la* estoit enclose

The husband opens the *laa*.

305 Puis a le *laa* descoverte,
Si l'a trestote en ample overte.
A icest mot li soris saut,
Tantost con le *laa* li faut,
S'est volee tote sovine . .

In the first passage above, verse 207 lacks a syllable which can be supplied by substituting *laa* for *la* or by merely replacing *qu'* by *que*. But the form *la* is attested in verse 292.

These words *la* and *laa* have every appearance of being late comers in Old French. In fact there is no doubt that they represent colloquial and popular variants of Middle Dutch *lade*, as the following notation in the dictionary of Verwijs and Verdam shows.² *Lade* (*la, laeye, laey, lay*) . . . in de spreektaal ook *laai, la* . . . *Kist, kistje* . . . Further³ it is stated that *laai* in the popular speech (in de volkstaal) corresponds particularly to *laeye*. The meaning 'box' (*kist*) fits perfectly the *la* and *laa* of our passages. The final syllable of *laa* (= *laai*) may be explained as a reduction of the diphthong *-ai* to *-a*, in the pronunciation of the dialect of Hamaut, the region of the author of the *fabliau*, Gautier Le Leu.⁴

La and *laa*, occurring in a *fabliau* destined for recitation before the people, were undoubtedly in popular use in Hamaut, in the

² *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* van wijlen Dr E Verwijs en Dr J Verdam. Vierde Deel, s'Gravenhage, 1885-1912, iv, col 21, 22, 23, *Lade*

³ *Ibid.*, iv, col 40, *Laeye*

⁴ This is a trait widely remarked in the east and northeast, both for *ai* final and in the interior of words. Cf A Långfors, *La Regres Nostre Dame*, Paris, 1907, LIII and LXXXIV. Cf *Del Fol vilam· lasqa* (je) 256, *sara* (je) 303, *sa* (je) 367.

13th century. Old French *laie* (mod. *laie*) and *larete* (mod. *layette*) which have been derived from Flemish *laeye*,⁵ another variant of Middle Dutch *lade*, do not appear in texts before late in the 14th century.⁶ It is possible that *laeye* is the etymon of *laie*, but *larete* (mod. *layette*) is best explained as a diminutive built directly on *la*. A form *laette* is attested in a document of Bouconville (Meuse) of 1485,⁷ and *learte*, found several times in a Lorraine text of 1471-1472, seems to be a dialectal variant of *la* + *ete*. Palsgrave,⁸ in the 16th century, points out that the pronunciation of *larete* is *la* + *rette*, and modern Walloon has *lânette*.⁹ The *Atlas linguistique, carte* 1304, at point 102, in the Nièvre, shows *âyet* (fem.) with open *a* bearing the accent, and with aphaeresis of *l*, confused with the article, and on the same *carte* (1304), *yēt* and *yēt*, which appear at various points in the centre and towards the west, doubtless represent *la-yette*, with aphaeresis, this time of *la*, construed to be the article, but which is another evidence that OF *la*, the original simplex, had maintained its integrity.¹⁰

Medieval forms *larete* and *layete* would represent *la* + *ete* with the glide sound *y* between the vowels in hiatus, which is so fre-

⁵ W Meyer-Lubke, *Rom Etym Wörterb*, 3d ed, no 4849

⁶ According to the examples cited by Godefroy and the *Dictionnaire Général*

⁷ The variants of *larete* which we discuss, are taken from the texts cited by Godefroy, *Dict*, IV, 700 b, unless other sources are indicated

⁸ As cited by Littré, *Dict*, under *layette*.

⁹ Cf Littré, *loc cit* Walloon *lâss* (Remacle, Forir), *lâse* (Grandgagnage) and Liégeois *lasse*, all in the sense of 'box,' are evidently not phonological developments of Middle Dutch forms. M. Haust (*Dict liégeois*, II, 361) hypothecates a **laye* for *lasse* and supposes analogy with *beûse* 'boîte'. These Walloon forms may well have been built on *la*. As analogical influence, might be mentioned *casse*, *chasse*, *cassette* (cf Liégeois *lassète*) from L *capsa* 'little box,' which are amply represented in the modern patois of the north and the northeast. Cf. Wartburg, *FfW*, II, 310 b

¹⁰ A patois form of approximately the same region, *hette* (= palatal *l* + *et* in the *Atlas*) would then be a reconstitution of *l* + *yet*, probably due to the influence of *layette* of the literary language. Godefroy gives several examples of *hette* (*hete*) in texts as early as the 16th and 17th centuries. There is the possibility that *hette* may in some patois be the product of a regular phonological development. In the Mâconnais, for example, where *layette* appears as *hette* (*tirov*), I note such forms as *fillete* (= *feuillete*), *route* (OF *reorte*), *siaton* (dim of *soellye* = *seau*), cf E Violet, *Les Patois mâconnais*, Paris, 1936

quently noted in the medieval dialectal texts of the northeast,¹¹ and which is represented in Modern French *bayer* (OF *baer*, cf. OF *baee*, *baree*, *bayee*), *déblayer* (OF *desbleer*, *desblaer*, *desbloer*) and *cahier* (OF *quaer*, *carer*, *cayer*).

Laette, *larete* (mod. *layette*), as early examples show, meant a box used for any purpose (relics, money, powder, papers, etc.) as did *la*. Modern meanings of *layette* (patois *āyet*, *yēt*, *hette*) are all readily traceable to this.¹²

We owe the preservation of the two 13th century forms *la* and *laa* in the *fabliau* to metrical reasons. Being popular and colloquial words, it is not surprising that they are rare in the literary texts.

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

Bowdoin College

NOTE ON THE TEXT OF *THE FAMOUS HISTORY OF SIR THOMAS WYATT*

It has been generally accepted that *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, published in 1607 as by Thomas Dekker and John Webster, represents a condensation or rewriting of *I and II Lady Jane*, paid for by Henslowe in October, 1602.¹ Studies attempting to determine the extent of the work of each author have been markedly unsuccessful.² In view of the fact that Henslowe named

¹¹ Cf. M. Wilmotte, *Études de philologie wallonne*, Paris, 1923, 63, 131; W. Meyer-Lubke, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, Paris, 1890, I, 323; A. Bayot, *Le Poème moral*, 1929, LXXXVI.

¹² The meaning in the patois is *tour*, *coffre*. In French *layette* means the contents, especially "bonnets, langes, robes, etc. pour un enfant nouveau-né" (*Dictionnaire*).

¹ E. K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, II, 227; E. E. Stoll, *John Webster*, pp. 47, 49; F. E. Pierce, *The Collaboration of Webster and Dekker*, *Yale Studies in English* XXXVII, F. L. Lucas, *The Complete Works of John Webster*, IV, 239; F. E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama 1558-1642*, I, 287. Record of the Henslowe payment: W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, I, 183.

² E. E. Stoll, *op cit*, p. 55, says that there is no one thing in the play that we can claim with any degree of assurance for Webster. F. E. Pierce, *op cit*, p. 159, gives most of six scenes to Webster, but he concedes that some of the scenes were certainly retouched by Dekker. F. L. Lucas, *op cit*, IV, 241, sees possible signs of Webster's hand in four scenes.

five men (Chettle, Dekker, Heywood, Smith, and Webster) that received pay for *I Lady Jane*,³ it is not surprising that efforts to separate with exactness the work of the authors named on the 1607 title page have failed.

The problem of collaboration is further complicated by the fact that the 1607 edition is a "bad" text.⁴ Because of the nature of the faults in the text, it is inconceivable that it was printed from the MS of Dekker and Webster, or from a transcription of their copy.

Aside from the sketchiness of the plot, the corruptions in the text consist chiefly of (1) mislining of the verse,⁵ and (2), in some cases, wrong assignment of speeches.⁶ This list does not take into account the usual printer's errors, which do not affect this study. If the modern reader is not too much offended by verse garbled in the lining, and if he reads "by ear" with a fair amount of tolerance for an occasional hiatus in the action and tolerance for promised

and concludes "but to try to prove more definite details of his [Webster's] share is, I think, merely, 'weaving nets to catch the wind'."

³ W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, I, 183.

⁴ M. L. Hunt, *Thomas Dekker*, p. 76, remarks about the bad condition of the text; and F. E. Schelling, *op cit*, I, 288, lays the condition of the text to the censor's excisions. Leo Kirschbaum ("A Census of Bad Quartos," *RBS*, XIV, 33-35) gives *Sir Thomas Wyatt* as one of the "bad quartos" and quotes lines "well reported" and a short section of the play "obviously corrupt." He quotes Mary F. Martin, who holds that the "poor style" points very clearly to the piracy of the play, "If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody and The Famous Historie of Sir Thomas Wyat" (*Library*, 4th ser. XIII, 274), and Madeleine Doran, who believes both the named plays to be reported texts (*If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, Malone Society Reprint, 1935, p. xviii). Instead of placing *Sir Thomas Wyatt* in the category of pirated or surreptitious texts, this present note, while admitting reporting of a sort, suggests that the play was not pirated for the printer but that the copy furnished the printer was a version of the play shortened by a traveling company for performance in the provinces. In other words, *Sir Thomas Wyatt* presents a corrupt, but legitimate, text, a legitimate text in the sense that we have the play as it was last acted. That we do not have the play as it was originally written by the dramatists is obvious.

⁵ The faulty lining appears throughout the text. Notable examples are to be found on A2, A2v, B₁, and B2.

⁶ On A3, Arundel is given a speech belonging to Suffolk, on A4, Guilford is given a speech that belongs to Jane.

incidents which do not occur as the action goes forward,⁷ he will find the play as satisfactory as the average Elizabethan historical play cobbled by five play craftsmen to meet a vogue in popular history plays.⁸ In other words, there is nothing in the text that could not have been cured by fast acting on the part of players familiar with the assignment of the speeches, who were accustomed to speak, not to write, verse, and who presented the play before a none too critical audience that already knew the story. The implication here is that the play is far less satisfactory as a text for reading than it was as a vehicle for acting under conditions to be pointed out.

It is the purpose of this note to suggest that the condition of the text and the difficulties encountered in determining the individual work of the named collaborators are to be explained by the history of the play as it changed form and had varying fortunes in the hands of the Companies to the time of its publication.

I Lady Jane was paid for by Henslowe for Worcester's Men playing at the Rose in the fall and early winter of 1602.⁹ A payment for a *Part II* was advanced.¹⁰ *Sir Thomas Wyatt* was printed as "Plaied by the Queens Maesties Seruants"¹¹ There is so much of *Lady Jane* in the printed play, and Sir Thomas Wyatt must certainly have figured prominently in a *Lady Jane* play, that critics have not hesitated to connect the titles and to consider the printed play as a revision of *Lady Jane*.¹² The identification is made more probable by the fact that, while we have the names of two companies connected with the play, only one acting personnel was involved, since Worcester's Men late in 1603 became the Queen's Company with only a few changes in actors. The personnel of the Queen's Company remained virtually the same until after 1609.¹³

⁷ M. L. Hunt, *op cit*, p. 76, remarks on the lack of a coronation scene for Queen Mary and the non-appearance of King Philip after both the coronation scene and Philip are promised on the title page.

⁸ Schelling, *op cit*, I, 287-8. The relation of the play to other histories is discussed by E. E. Stoll, *op cit*, pp. 46-7.

⁹ W. W. Greg, *op cit*, I, 183.

¹⁰ E. K. Chambers, *op cit*, II, 288, has conjectured that the *Part II* was never completed.

¹¹ Title page of the 1607 edition.

¹² See note 1, above.

¹³ J. T. Murray, *English Dramatic Companies 1558-1642*, I, 52-3, 185, 187.

The play in some form, under some title, seems to have been the playing property of the same group of actors from 1602 to its publication as *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 1607

Worcester's Men, who owned the *Lady Jane* play, or plays, acted at the Rose until March 16, 1603, when they moved to The Boar's Head¹⁴ After May 26, when London was suffering from the plague, Worcester's Men played in the Provinces¹⁵ When the actors appeared in London as the Queen's Company about April, 1604, they played at the Curtain,¹⁶ an old out of date theatre The Queen's Company was essentially a travelling company.¹⁷

The nature of the present text indifferent lining of verse, careless assignment of speeches, hiatuses in the plot, length of the play (1475 lines, Pearson reprint edition), all suggest an actors' built version of a play (or two parts) shortened for performances in the Provinces

The hypothesis is that no professional writer's hand appeared at all in the MS from which the 1607 text was printed. Both Dekker and Webster were writing for the Children of Paul's in 1604 (*Westward Ho*), and the present text would scarcely warrant the labors of both or either of these highly professional men, who certainly knew how to write lines of verse. The Company was made up of actors perfectly familiar with the lines and with the general plot of *Lady Jane*, they knew the requirements for a version to be acted by a travelling troupe, and it must have been a simple task for them to combine their efforts to produce a shortened version acceptable to the yokels in the Provinces, or even to the crowd at the Curtain. A version made by the important players selecting scenes and reciting familiar lines to a writer who did not know, or was indifferent, about the lining of verse would have been simpler and more economical than a textual revision of the prompt-book of *Lady Jane*.

Exactly when the shortened actors' version was put into the manuscript form from which the 1607 edition was printed is a difficult question. The possibilities are (1) when Worcester's Men moved to The Boar's Head, (2) when they left The Boar's Head for the

¹⁴ *Ibid*, I, 55

¹⁵ E K Chambers, *op cit*, II, 229, J T Murray, *op cit*, I, 55

¹⁶ J T Murray, *op cit*, I, 186

¹⁷ *Ibid*, I, 187

Provinces, or while they were touring, (3) after becoming the Queen's Company, any time to the publication of the play, (4) the copy may have been hastily compiled just before printing, after the Company decided to release it to the printer. The wrong assignments of speeches may represent either ignorance or oversight in hasty last minute editing of the copy

The possibilities and probabilities seem very great that *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 1607, was printed from an actors' built version of a Wyatt-Lady Jane plot shortened for performance in the Provinces. The title-page ascription to Dekker and Webster went back to the remembered work of those two dramatists in the original version, or versions, of 1602.

W. L. HALSTEAD

University of Miami, Florida

IZAAK WALTON, *PROCHEIN AMY*

The usually mild and tolerant Izaak Walton occasionally spoke somewhat sharply of the law and lawyers. At the beginning of the *Compleat Angler*, for instance, he makes PISCATOR say

the Primitive Christians . . . were (as most *Anglers* are) quiet men, and followed peace, men that were too wise to sell their consciences to buy riches for vexation, and a fear to die Men that lived in those times when there were fewer Lawyers, for then a Lordship might have been safely conveyed in a piece of Parchment no bigger than your hand, though several skins are not sufficient in this wiser Age¹

And in his will Walton refers to "the extreme crewelty of the Law of this nation."²

A suspicion that such remarks were inspired at least to some extent by personal experience with the law's asperities is confirmed by the discovery that from 1648 to 1650 Walton was engaged in a long, troublesome, and unsatisfactory lawsuit, about which nothing has previously been reported. It may have been of this very suit that he was thinking when he wrote "I became like those men that enter easily into a Law-sute, or a quarrel, and having begun, cannot make a fair retreat and be quiet, when they desire it."³

¹ *Compleat Angler*, 1653, pp 8, 9

² The manuscript is in the Harvard College Library

³ "Epistle to the Reader," *Lives*, 1670

At any rate, as I have pieced it together, the case began with the marriage of one Nicholas Lewis, Esquire, of Eglwysillan, County Glamorgan, Wales, to Martha Fortescue, one of the daughters of Sir Nicholas Fortescue, the elder (1575?-1633), chamberlain of the exchequer.⁴ Sir Nicholas agreed to endow her with a marriage portion of £1000. Later, apparently because Nicholas Lewis could not be trusted with the money, an arrangement was made whereby Sir Nicholas retained the £1000, so that it would come to the children by the marriage, meanwhile paying Lewis interest upon it. Later still Sir Nicholas paid Lewis £300 of the £1000 to help him out of debt. In 1633 Sir Nicholas died, still in possession of the remaining £700, and having appointed as executors Sir Basil Brooke, of Madeley, Shropshire, Walter Brooke, Esquire, of Lapley, Staffordshire (both dead by 1648), Francis Plowden, Esquire, of Shiplake, Oxfordshire, and William Lake, Esquire, of London. According to Izaak Walton's allegation to the Court of Chancery, November 20, 1648,⁵ from which the above facts are taken, these executors colluded to take the revenues of the estate, and also to raise upon it some £8000, during eight or nine years. They did, however, about 1639, pay Nicholas Lewis £300 of the £700 still due him as dowry, promising the rest.

On August 9, 1645, Nicholas Lewis made his will,⁶ bequeathing to his daughter Martha the £400 still due, and some time thereafter died. But the executors he had appointed—Francis Finch, of Russcoke, Worcestershire, and Edmond Fortescue, Esquire, of Kidderminster, Worcestershire—refused to serve, as did his wife later. Upon this Walton appears in the case. On June 14, 1648, he was granted letters of administration of Lewis's estate,⁶ which show that in the meantime he had been appointed "prochein amy" ("next friend"), or guardian,⁷ of the children, Nicholas and Martha.

Whether, as this implies, he was a near relation of the Lewises is not known. Thus fortified, however, he presented in Chancery on

⁴ See *DNB*, xx, 47-8

⁵ Public Record Office, *Chancery Proceedings 1649-1714*, Collins 101/96

⁶ Principal Probate Registry, Essex 101 (August, 1648)

⁷ "To constitute a Prochein Amy (or Guardian) the person intended, who is usually some near relation, goes with the infant before a Judge." Sir T. E. Tomlins, *Law Dictionary*, 3rd edition, London, 1820, art. "Prochein Amy."

November 20, 1648, the long allegation referred to above, in which he petitioned that Plowden and Lake be subpoenaed to appear and answer his charges. After various delays on their part (recorded in *Decrees and Orders* of the court),⁸ the matter at last came to a hearing on May 18 and 20, 1650, a year and a half later.⁹ Walton produced a witness, Richard Collier, who swore that Plowden had signed and sealed an agreement to pay the £400. This Plowden denied, and a trial to determine whether he had or had not was set for the next Oxford Assizes. In the meantime Walton unearthed "a deed . . . under the defendant's hand and seal which will give an end to the differences," as he alleged in his petition of July 23, 1650, asking that it be accepted by the court.¹⁰ His request was denied. As, unfortunately, the records of the Oxford Assizes of that period have been lost, we shall probably never know whether Martha Lewis got the £400 or not, and I have been unable to trace the matter any further.

Our principal concern in the case, however, is not with Martha Lewis, but with Walton. In the first place, as has been said, it suggests a personal background for his *obiter dicta* about the law. In the second, it links him, and in an unsuspected capacity, with some persons about whom his biographers have heretofore known nothing. We can only guess at the causes for this linking. It is not impossible that he was related to the Lewis or Fortescue family, for little is known of Walton's family tree. At any rate, it is interesting to recall that Sir Nicholas Fortescue had a house in Fetter Lane,¹¹ and that Walton lived in the very next street, Chancery Lane. In the same sort of connection, it is also interesting to learn that a Francis Finch was living nearby in 1621 and 1625.¹² He may have been an ironmonger,¹³ which (as Walton was a member

⁸ Public Record Office, *Court of Chancery, Entry Books of Decrees and Orders*, 1648B, p. 439, 1649B, pp. 201 (two entries), 453b, 361.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 1649B, pp. 611b, 612a, 691b.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1649B, p. 1036.

¹¹ *DNB*, xx, 48.

¹² Public Record Office, *Exchequer King's Remembrancer Subsidy Rolls*, Lay Series V (London), Farringdon Without, 19 James I (E179 147/505) and 1 Charles I (E179 147/537).

¹³ The entry just above his in the 1625 roll is "Robert Greene, Ironmonger", after Finch's name, and under the word "Ironmonger," appears a mark which may be intended for a quotation mark.

of the Ironmongers' Company) suggests that honest Izaak may have been performing a fraternal kindness for the widow of a former member. Whether Nicholas Lewis was a member of the Company, however, is not known, and since this Francis Finch may have been neither an ironmonger nor the same man whom Lewis appointed executor, such speculation rests upon extremely tenuous grounds. Yet one who studies Walton's life learns that he tended to make fast and lifelong friends of his neighbors. The "Mr. Adams," for instance, who (with "Mr. Churchell") represented Walton in this case, was probably the "William Adams Attorney" whose name appears just above Walton's in the Lay Subsidy Roll of 1625 whence comes part of our information about Finch.¹⁴

Finally, the facts of the case supply a little information about Walton's whereabouts at the time in question. Anthony à Wood said that Walton left London in 1643 "and lived sometimes at Stafford, and elsewhere, but mostly in the Families of the eminent Clergymen of England"¹⁵ This case, however, indicates (as do facts which I have accumulated in another place)¹⁶ that he was probably in London after 1643 more than has generally been supposed. On the whole, while this lawsuit is trivial in itself, its implications concerning several of Walton's years are fresh and interesting.

ARTHUR M. COON

The University of Minnesota

PRÉVOST'S *MÉMOIRES POUR SERVIR À L'HISTOIRE DE LA VERTU*

In the spring of 1762 the Abbé Prévost published in four volumes at Cologne a translation entitled *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la vertu*.¹ This was a rendering of one of the most successful

¹⁴ See Note 12

¹⁵ *Athenae Oxonienses*, 1813-20, I, 698

¹⁶ *The Life of Izaak Walton*, Ph D Thesis, Cornell University, 1938, pp 153-179

¹ This novel was included by Bernard d'Héry in Prévost's collected works of 1783-1785, apparently not as a translation but as an original work by

of the works of the Richardson school, Frances Sheridan's lachrymose *Memours of Miss Sidney Bidulph* (1761), a novel which has been remembered because of Dr. Johnson's protest against the suffering it caused its readers. The translation gained immediate popularity. It was described as another triumph for the little Abbé by *l'Année littéraire* ² and the *Mercure de France*; ³ it provoked a rival translation from the pen of René Robinet, ⁴ and Bachaumont, although observing that the book was inferior to others of Prévost's composition, remarked that it was enjoying a "grande vogue," and that it was "le livre du jour." ⁵ The only expression of unqualified disapproval seems to have come from Grimm, who condemned the novel as a bad imitation of Richardson, and found Prévost's translating discredibly inaccurate ⁶.

It seems to be generally believed that the *Mémoires pour servir* is an "adaptation rather than a strict translation" ⁷ and that it

the Abbé himself. A number of subsequent writers, evidently misled by d'Héry, have believed that Prévost was the author of the novel. Among these are Quérard, *La France littéraire*, VII, 342 [elsewhere, however, Quérard makes the correct attribution], Barbier, *Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes* (3d ed., Paris, 1882), III, 240, and Joseph Texte, *Jean Jacques Rousseau et les origines du cosmopolitisme littéraire* (Paris, 1895), p. 274.

² 1762, III, 289, 320-321.

³ July, 1762, I, 84.

⁴ Robinet's translation, entitled *Mémoires de Miss Sidney Bidulph, extraits de son journal*, was published in three volumes at Amsterdam in 1762. In 1768 Robinet also translated Mrs. Sheridan's sequel, which had just appeared. See Henry Harrisse, *L'Abbé Prevost Histoire de sa vie et de ses œuvres* (Paris, 1896), p. 409. This translation of the sequel was included, strangely enough, in the collected editions of Prévost's works.

⁵ *Mémoires secrets*, I, 76.

⁶ Grimm writes "On prétend que la traduction est de M. l'abbé Prévost, et l'on a de la peine à le croire, parce qu'elle est remplie de négligences qu'on ne peut pardonner à un écrivain aussi exercé, aussi facile et aussi correct que M. l'abbé Prevost" (*Correspondance littéraire*, ed. Maurice Tourneux, Paris 1878, v, 98). Undue importance must not be attached to the strictures of Grimm, who, in 1762, was engaged in his historic quarrel with Rousseau. He had recently written with sweeping condemnation of *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, and he is now able to find in the new novel of sensibility the same faults which he had found in Rousseau's masterpiece. He condemns them both as among the "mauvaises copies" which the novels of Richardson have had the ill fate to inspire.

⁷ Ernest A. Baker, *The History of the English Novel* (London: H. F. & G. Witherby, 1934), v, 144.

thus forms a parallel to Prévost's versions of the novels of Richardson. In his *Clarisse* and *Grandisson*, as Mr Frank Howard Wilcox has pointed out,⁸ the translator made excisions and alterations at will. He omitted details which were repetitive or merely episodical, details which although contributing to the understanding of character and situation delayed the action. He left out pedantic quotations, scraps of poetry, and many pages of moral reflections. He also omitted or greatly altered scenes of passion in which the libertine attempted the virtue of the heroine or scenes of coarse realism which might have given offense to fastidious readers. He thus cut away about one-tenth of *Clarissa* and about one-half of *Sir Charles Grandisson*, and incidentally got rid of nearly all that was most characteristic of Richardson.

When we come to examine his treatment of Mrs Sheridan's novel, however, we find a remarkable contrast. Here he makes no excisions of importance, but follows the original, paragraph for paragraph and sentence for sentence, through almost the entire novel. Alterations are numerous but of small significance, affecting the style rather than the subject matter. Prévost made no attempt to obtain French equivalents for Mrs. Sheridan's colloquialisms and racy epithets, but removed all such expressions in favor of a concise, decorous prose which was more in conformity with eighteenth-century French ideals of the classical style. His method of translating may be illustrated by a few of the changes he makes. An indignant declaration "I see plainly that old piece of formality, Lady Grimston's infernal shrivelled paw in all this!"⁹ is toned down to "Je ne reconnois que trop, dans toute cette aventure, l'infemale main de la Grimston."¹⁰ "The dean is as frolick as May-day"¹¹ becomes "Le doyen rajeunit de galeté"¹² Where the villainess was dubbed "the undaunted Jezebel,"¹³ the Frenchman with more courtesy calls her "l'effrontée."¹⁴ Moreover, "and the crocodile pretended to drop a tear"¹⁵ is altered to "ici la tendre Goring prétendit verser une larme"¹⁶ Modifications similar to these occur on every page and form by far the largest category of

⁸ "Prévost's Translations of Richardson's Novels," *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, XII, No 5 (1927), 341-411

⁹ *Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* (3d ed., London, 1767), I, 195

¹⁰ *Oeuvres choisies* (Amsterdam and Paris, 1783-1785), xxx, 160

¹¹ I, 190

¹² II, 47

¹⁵ II, 98

¹³ xxx, 155

¹⁴ xxx, 312.

¹⁶ xxx, 355

variants between the two texts. There are others, of course. The translator occasionally removes a sentence which borders on the "low," or he strikes out a passage of specific and slightly wearisome detail. Occasionally too he alters a passage which relates to the Roman church, although there seems to be no consistency on this point.

There are a number of alterations which reflect the Frenchman's desire to avoid offending national sensibilities. He deletes a few miscellaneous slurs at France. Thus "the wine was excellent, not that poor sort which is commonly drunk in France"¹⁷ becomes simply "le vin étoit excellent"¹⁸ "The ladies in France do not think it any disgrace to have lovers"¹⁹ is altered to "Les dames, en France, ne se croient pas déshonorées par l'amour qu'on a pour elles"²⁰ A few insults to the English are inserted. A character who is called "the greatest villain in England"²¹ is styled more inclusively "un des grands vilains d'Angleterre"²² The parlor of an English mansion is described as excessively cold because it has been newly washed, and Prévost adds "suivant l'insupportable usage de notre nation"²³ The translator once or twice inserts a sly reference to Americans, their bad manners and their fondness for strong drink. One of the characters, an eccentric West Indian, deliberately calls for his pipe with the intention of annoying a fastidious English lady with tobacco smoke. Here Mrs Sheridan wrote "I took it for granted the compliment was meant for Lady Sarah."²⁴ This appears in the French as "Je n'ai pas douté que son compliment Américain n'eût rapport à miladi"²⁵ A similar insertion reminds the reader of the liberal use of wine among Americans. The English novelist had written "He [the West Indian] had sent me in the morning a hamper of excellent wine, and seemed to relish his bottle with an extraordinary good goust."²⁶ Referring it would seem to the consumption of wine in the semi-tropical parts of the New World, Prévost altered the passage to "Il paroît qu'à l'exemple de tous nos américains, il n'a pas d'aversion pour la bouteille."²⁷

As Grimm's remarks would lead us to believe, there are occa-

¹⁷ II, 120-121

¹⁸ xxx, 373

¹⁹ II, 143

²⁰ xxx, 392

²¹ III, 226

²² xxxi, 342

²³ xxxi, 110

²⁴ III, 174

²⁵ xxxi, 295

²⁶ III, 122

²⁷ xxxi, 249-250

sional variants which simply represent errors of translation. Prévost evidently worked with his usual haste and committed a number of minor blunders.²⁸ He thus rendered "by-the-bye"²⁹ as "par accident",³⁰ and "an immensity of vanity and frothy chat"³¹ as "une abondance de froids récits."³² Pall Mall becomes "la rue Pall-Mall,"³³ and the Haymarket "le marché au foin."³⁴ And for such an every-day idiom as "I was nettled at the question"³⁵ he was capable of writing, "Je me suis trouvée dans quelque embarras."³⁶ On the whole, however, these "negligences" are by no means as frequent as the censure of Grimm would lead us to believe.

It is clear that the translator made a good many minor changes in his text and that most of these changes were involuntary. There are a few alterations, however, which were made deliberately. A firm believer in the irresistible power of the passions, Prévost was by no means satisfied with the tranquil manner in which the heroine of the English novel sacrificed love on the altar of duty. Accordingly he inserted "Que faire! Quel moyen de l'oublier?"³⁷ amid her mild complaints upon the loss of her lover. He was shocked, moreover, at certain light-hearted descriptions of the follies of society which the heroine penned when presumably she should have been broken-hearted. Doubtless preferring the orgies of grief into which his own hapless lovers were plunged, he introduced a passage which explained away such levity

Le travail, mes livres, ma plume, n'en remplissent pas tous les instans
Mais comptez que votre amie sera vertueuse, malgré les revoltes de son
cœur, & sans le secours des leçons de miladi. A la vérité, le fond de mon
humeur est un peu changé cependant je sais reprendre l'air de gaieté en
quittant ma solitude, & vous pouvez remarquer vous-même, qu'en vous
écrivaint j'aspire à vous égayer aussi. Je n'ai pas d'ailleurs un grand usage
à faire ici de mon air joyeux. Les matins & les soirs sont du même ton.³⁸

²⁸ F. H. Wilcox, *op cit*, pp 353-354, points out that Prévost's translations of *Clarissa* and *Sir Charles Grandison* are "full of errors." He attributes this deficiency to the haste with which Prévost worked and to his slightly imperfect knowledge of English. Apparently Prévost is no more inaccurate in the *Mémoires pour servir* than he had been in his previous translations.

²⁹ II, 291

³² xxx, 30

³⁵ I, 171

³⁸ xxx, 105.

³⁰ xxxi, 89

³³ xxxi, 256.

³⁶ xxx, 138

³¹ I, 47.

³⁴ xxxi, 261.

³⁷ xxx, 143

In like manner when the young lady receives the not unwelcome command that she marry the man with whom she has long been in love, she exclaims to herself. "Ciel! quel excès imprévu de félicité!"³⁹ Except for these slight attempts to intensify the heroine's grief, Prévost makes no additions to *Sidney Bidulph*.

In translating Richardson, Prévost discarded passages which obstructed the narrative or which were otherwise objectionable to French taste. His *Mémoires pour servir*, however, contains no alterations of any importance. In an age of unlicensed translation, it stands out as remarkably faithful to the English original. The statement that it is an adaptation rather than a strict translation is therefore unsupported by the facts.

S P CHEW, JR.

The University of Wisconsin

NOTE ON THE ETYMOLOGY OF NAMES IN VOLTAIRE'S *ZADIG*

The possibility of Hebrew origin for some of the proper names in *Zadig* seems to have largely escaped the notice of commentators. Such an origin is quite probable for one name, for which no solution has as yet been proposed, and seems at least possible for two other names.

Ascoli's note to the character Almona is "Je n'ai pu déterminer l'origine de ce nom."¹ Almona is evidently the Hebrew word *almonah*, which means "widow." Voltaire, in fact, speaks of "la veuve Almona." That Voltaire did glean Hebrew words here and there is shown by his display of Hebrew terms in the *Dictionnaire Philosophique* (e. g. *Eloim*, *Haddebarim*, *Vacra*).

For the name Azora, Ascoli has this note

Encore un nom de couleur orientale au gré de Voltaire. Le nom d'Azor, illustré par des contes du XVIII^e siècle, avant la comédie de Marmontel, est aussi le nom d'une ville de l'ancienne Palestine, sans parler du fondateur de Ninive et de l'Assyrie, Assur.²

Price, on the other hand, suggested that the name is drawn from

³⁹ *xxx*, 379

¹ Voltaire, *Zadig*, éd. crit. de Georges Ascoli (Hachette, 1929), II, 90

² *Ibid.*, II, 17.

the expression *appeler azor*, and linked Azora to Voltaire's experience with Mlle Livry, an actress.³ Another possibility is that the name is taken from the Hebrew *hatsoroh*, "the affliction" or "the woe." The meaning, taken figuratively, fits in very well with the character of Zadig's first wife, who, after having criticized the faithlessness of a widow of Ephesus, is ready to cut off the nose of her supposedly dead husband to save the life of a prospective lover. The dropping of the initial *h* from *hatsoroh* may be explained as an attempt to make the names analogous to the others beginning in *A*. Asrael, Arimaze, Astarté, Almona, Arbogad. In addition, it must be said that Voltaire is not always very accurate in his transcription of Hebrew words—cf. the writing of *Yerushalaim* (Jerusalem) as *Hershalaim*.⁴ The Hebrew word, then, is as close to the name of the character as any of the other suggestions and seems suitable as an epithet.

For the name Zadig, both Ascoli⁵ and Price⁶ give as ultimate source the Arabic words *Seddik*, "faithful and authentic witness," and *Sadik*, "righteous one." Ascoli attributes the initial *Z* to the vogue of names in *Z*, e. g. Zaire, Alzire, Zamore. Price, following the theory that more than one factor may have entered into any one name, proposed in addition to the Arabic origin the Hebrew name Zadoc, founder of the Sadducees. He pointed out that this Hebrew name has the meaning of "just man."⁷ It is indeed possible that Voltaire was influenced by Hebrew in forming the name of his hero. However, the common Hebrew word *tsadik*, "righteous one," seems closer to the name Zadig than is Price's suggestion.⁸

Thus, when Voltaire spoke of Hebrew as "votre détestable jargon,"⁹ he apparently forgot that he had already made use of it, probably for one name, Almona, and possibly for two others, Zadig and Azora.

HAROLD MEYERSON

Rutgers University

³ Price, W. R., *The Symbolism of Voltaire's Novels* (Columbia U. Press, 1911), p. 120.

⁴ Voltaire, *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, article "Juifs," "Sixième Lettre"

⁵ Ascoli, *op cit*, II, 9 ⁶ Price, *op cit*, p. 75 ⁷ *Ibid*, p. 77

⁸ It might also be noted that the three Hebrew words discussed here are also found in Yiddish

⁹ V. note 4, above.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF "A POEM TO THE MEMORY OF
MR. CONGREVE"

A Poem to the Memory of Mr Congreve, published by John Millan early in May, 1729, has been hesitantly included among James Thomson's works ever since Peter Cunningham, on a suggestion from Henry Francis Cary, claimed it for Thomson in 1843 in one of the reprints issued by the Percy Society. The only external evidence in support of this attribution seems to be the fact that Millan was publishing for Thomson at this time, and in his advertisements grouped the lines on Congreve with pieces by Thomson. The internal evidence is naturally inconclusive.¹ Morel and Macaulay doubt Thomson's authorship, and J. Logie Robertson remarks in his note on the poem, "Mallet may have written it—never Thomson"² This comment proves to be very much to the point. On May 24, 1729, Millan advertised in the *London Journal* "A Poem to the Memory of Mr. Congreve, By the AUTHOR of the EXCURSION," and on March 9, 1730, in the *Daily Post*, "A Poem to the Memory of Mr. Congreve, By the Author of Wilham and Margarate [*sic*], a Ballad"³ Thus Mallet's authorship is twice certified by the bookseller.

ALAN D. MCKILLOP

The Rice Institute

¹ For an argument for Thomson's authorship, based on internal evidence, see George G. Williams, "Did Thomson Write the Poem *To the Memory of Mr Congreve?*," *PMLA*, XLV (1930), 1010-13

² Léon Morel, *James Thomson* (Paris, 1895), p 502, G C Macaulay, *James Thomson* (London, 1908), p 192, J Logie Robertson ed, *Complete Poetical Works of James Thomson* (Oxford, 1908), p 462

³ The second advertisement gives the name as "Wilham" Millan, instead of John Millan, but along with the Congreve poem it lists Thomson's *Britannia*, the fifth edition of *Winter*, and the fourth edition of the lines on Newton There can be no doubt about the identity of the bookseller

REVIEWS

Tudor Puritanism A Chapter in the History of Idealism. By
M. M. KNAPPEN Chicago. The University of Chicago Press,
1939. Pp. xii + 555. \$4 00.

The author of this book does not lump together the customs, ideas, and issues of 1553, 1583, 1603, and 1643 as do most other recent writers on sixteenth-century social history, but marks stages of development. He knows that there were many Puritan spirits, not one only. He shows, for example, that Barnes and Knox were formative influences and that in the Hooper-Ridley controversy Hooper's inevitable vagueness enabled Ridley to state the Anglican position on essential things and things indifferent. The author makes clear likewise in the hatred of the Puritans for the Anabaptists the exact status of conventicles. He knows the flux and flow of partisanship in politics and religion, the results of weariness on radicals, and the sobering effects of age and responsibility. One who knows the historiography of Puritanism may also rejoice in the author's breadth of view and his impartiality.

The book begins by making clear the two controlling dogmas of Puritanism—the Bible as the sole authority for the Christian religion, a dogma argued fundamentally by Hooker, and the doctrine of justification by faith alone. It affords new and most significant treatments of the first group of Protestant exiles, those who fled abroad after the passage of the Act of the Six Articles in 1539, and of the troubles at Frankfort. There is a banishment of confusion and the presentation of many points of great interest, like the surveys made by the Puritan party about 1585 as to the fitness of the clergy (p. 292), the actual numbers of the Puritans (p. 333), and the defence of Puritanism from the charge of being unduly swayed by the Old Testament (p. 360). The author even refutes Macaulay's slur by showing that Puritans did oppose bear-baiting because they were sorry for the bear (p. 430). He denies that the asceticism of English Puritans was derived from Calvin or was home-grown, traces it to mediaeval tradition, and shows the Puritan's joy in the practice of his religion. The book is sound and extremely interesting.

There are of course points on which one is disposed to question the author's opinions. His somewhat depreciatory treatment of Calvin is hardly justifiable even in the light of his own book. His picture of Queen Elizabeth is a rather conventional one. There is no doubt that the Queen was from the beginning the principal and at times the only obstacle to the success of the Puritan cause, but it

is doubtful if one needs to attribute to her great foresight or any philosophy. One has to do mainly with mere reactionary stubbornness. Perhaps because of his conception of Queen Elizabeth the author places much responsibility for the failure of the Marian exiles to secure a thorough reformation on the tactlessness of the Genevan political pamphlets of Goodman, Knox, and others. Aylmer, presented in more sympathetic fashion than usual, and Humphrey, who always commands respect, strove in vain to salvage the really valuable experience of the exiles. In general, there is perhaps too much responsibility for failure placed on Puritan tactlessness.

Cartwright's importance, his scholarship, and his undoubted logical acumen are rather cursorily treated in spite of Cartwright's fundamental presentation of the case for the biblical government of the church, a case which Whitfield failed to shake and to which Hooker devoted major attention. Whitgift, on the other hand, seems to come out too well. According to the author, Whitgift underwent, through the opposition of Burgley and Walsingham, a serious check in his house-cleaning about 1585. This is true, but, as the author adds in another place (p. 296), Whitgift found in Bancroft, his secretary, an ideal agent for repression. The author gives possibly too little weight to the suppressions of Whitgift's time—arrests of printers and attorneys, deprivations, and extensive silencings. In point of fact, it is hardly justifiable to treat the Puritans thus lamed as a party at all, especially after the act of 1593 which sent so many into banishment and drove so many into separatism, still less to treat the Hampton Court Conference as more than a farce. Sutcliffe's gloatings over "clowns and clouters," Cosin's defence of the *ex officio* oath, Bilsen's maunderings about perpetual government, and Bancroft's powerful, though often false, denunciations are scarcely to be considered in the realm of controversy. The author seems disposed, by the way, to think that Bancroft did not mean to advocate the divine right of bishops in his famous sermon at Paul's Cross.

One can hardly regard the author's treatment of Hooker as adequate. *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* is more in relation to the Puritan controversy than merely an utterance of sweet reasonableness. Its fairness and justice caused the neglect of the first four books and the neglect and partial loss of the last three. The reception of Hooker's book by his own party is significant and probably caused the inconsistent revision of the fifth book which the author glances at (p. 301) as a tendency to "gloss over serious shortcomings in the current establishment." Then perhaps Dudley Fenner's importance as a systematic theologian is to be partly explained by superior powers of exposition derived from the Ramist system of logic. He wrote Ramist treatises on logic and rhetoric (1584). Perkins and Travers may owe clarity to the same influence. Ramist logic is merely Aristotelian logic rearranged and

simplified. Again there is nothing surprising in the lack of modernity in the university curriculum of the sixteenth century, which had remained almost unchanged since the thirteenth century. Modern science had hardly made a beginning in the sixteenth century, and Puritan methodology is the methodology of the age.

As to the author's own views, very charily presented, there is the recurrent opinion that a solution of religious difficulties might have been found by giving to religious leaders a share of political power. The author also seems to regard as mistaken theology the exaltation of the Bible into a sole guide. He is an excellent theologian and he sees the confusion which attends that dogma, but perhaps it is just as well to have such a variable to serve the ends of freedom. The author actually says that the Puritan statesmen failed to recognize their natural allies among the Catholics of the age. The Catholic church was now completely reformed, and by uniting with the Catholics the Puritans might have restored "the united front broken at Worms" (p. 185).

Finally, there is one suggestion to be offered as an addition to the thought that underlies Professor Knappen's book. The author perhaps fails to realize that sixteenth-century Puritanism itself is a manifestation of that quickening of the human spirit which we call the Renaissance. One would not quibble about terms, but it is plain that, though the Puritans turned aside from the love of beauty and the artistic urge which characterizes the Renaissance as ordinarily defined and understood and though Puritanism may be said to have destroyed the creative promise of the humanists of Sir Thomas More's time and obliged the English poets to go again to Italy to relight their lamps, it is yet true that the Puritans and the writers of Spenser's time are actuated by the same great human urge. To be sure the Puritans did not have the broad interest in pure learning of an Erasmus (p. 466). There were few or none of them Platonists in the sense that More and Colet were, but they had Neo-Platonism transmuted into Christian idealism, and it burned in them with genuine ardor. The doctrine of salvation by faith alone is but a development of Neo-Platonism. The Puritan's faith in the written word of God and his unshakable belief in the soundness of his own position rest on a belief that truth not only will but must prevail. Passive resistance, "futile in the face of government employing stronger measures" (p. 314), is an equally idealistic if not mystical element akin to Platonism and therefore a Renaissance element. The Puritan's objection to separatism is the manifestation of a belief in the ideal of a church of God one and indivisible.

There is then no need to complain of the backwardness of the Puritan movement. It was not backward in the hands of Calvin, or Cartwright, or the author's favorite preachers, Henry Smith, William Perkins, and Richard Greenham. The backwardness does not belong to sixteenth-century Puritanism, but to the breakdown

of the Renaissance at the end of the century. Then came satire, criticism, indifference, the weariness of the idealist. Then came Sabbatarianism and decline in charitable activity. At that time it was more attractive to denounce fine clothes and secular amusements than it was to preach the hard quest of the eternal city according to the Calvinistic system.

HARDIN CRAIG

Stanford University

The Voyagers and Elizabethan Drama By ROBERT RALSTON CAWLEY. M L. A. A. Monograph series, VIII Boston D C Heath and Co., London Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp xiv + 428 \$4.00.

The author has examined most thoroughly the major and minor Elizabethan and 17th century drama and a considerable part of the non-dramatic literature as well, and has given us, as a result, a body of material which scholars in this field will find, I think, of unusual interest. It is primarily a scholar's reference book, and, being [as it is] well indexed and provided with a sound bibliography that refers the reader on to special bibliographies in adjacent fields, it provides both invaluable aids to the specialist investigator and matter of great interest to the general student of the period.

At the same time, it is not, as the author points out, a source-book. Rather, it is an attempt to lay side by side two companion pictures—the material of the tales that the voyagers wrote or reported by word of mouth on the one hand and the picture that the dramatists made out of this material on the other hand. The very laying side by side of the two is a considerable service to our knowledge and understanding of both and even if the reader sometimes wishes that Professor Cawley would be a little less modest and would indulge rather more freely in the drawing of his own conclusions—if only to the extent of a final surveying chapter—we readily accept his own account of his purpose, to present the evidence in this volume and the inferences and conclusions in a later one. Those of us who have read this, the first one, will await the second with lively interest, hoping that it may not be too long withheld.

If the book appears here and there to lack symmetry, as in the comparative neglect of the central Asian territories which laid so firm a hold on Marlowe's imagination and his readers', we shall find the explanation of this in the author's references, in his preface, to the work of other scholars who are covering portions of this field. It is to this extent a piece of team-work and, as in scien-

tific field work, the author is not necessarily free to delimit his own assignment

Without wishing to appear ungrateful for so thorough and so suggestive a piece of research, there is one point upon which I should like to expostulate on behalf of the general reader, and that is the method of referring to passages from the plays in the form 'Works p 23' in the footnotes. This brevity is in itself admirable and we might all do well to adopt it, but it needs to be backed by an easily accessible table of the editions intended and for these to be consistently used both in the footnotes and in the bibliography. Even so, I am not sure that the old method of reference by act, scene and (if possible) line, even if more cumbersome, is not kinder to the general scholar, who will usually have one or two editions of the given poet in his library, but may be unable to satisfy his laudable desire to read the passage for himself in its setting if the reference is to some other and perhaps less usual edition. This is a minor matter, but one which is worth considering for the sake of the general scholar who is not an expert in the particular field and certainly for the general reader.

But it is, after all, to the mine of information in the body of the text that we return on re-examining the book and here the material collected is both rich and comprehensive. The author brings together into his conspectus a wide range of contemporary accounts. These vary, as is inevitable with Elizabethan records, from carefully authenticated reports such as Jenkinson's to fairy tales very little removed from some of Mandeville's, but Professor Cawley's sure grasp of the conditions and of the state of Elizabethan information enables him to guide us through what might otherwise be a confusion of evidence, showing how far given comments represent the average knowledge or belief of the times and how far they are exceptional. In the same way he treats the passages which the dramatists built upon these descriptions (or upon others like them, which, though they have no written records, were indubitably "in the air"), revealing by implication as he does so something of the various methods of treating their sources that distinguish the different dramatists.

It is a volume to which, we may well believe, later interpretations or reconstructions of the Elizabethan mind will be indebted, and though it does not attempt the task of simultaneous survey and deduction which we find in Professor Chew's recent work *The Crescent and the Rose*, that comprehensive picture of interrelations between east and west, it is a valuable collection of relevant evidence in a similar field.

UNA ELLIS-FERMOR

University of London

Beaumont & Fletcher (A Concise Bibliography). Philip Massinger (*A Concise Bibliography*) George Chapman (*A Concise Bibliography*). By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM. Elizabethan Bibliographies, nos. 3, 4, 5 (in one vol.) New York: Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 1938. Pp. x + 94 + VIII + 40 + VIII + 40. \$5.50.

These bibliographies, as Dr. Tannenbaum is quick to admit, make no pretense to completeness, and no one who ever hopes to publish a bibliography will criticize him for omissions, obvious though some of them may be. The Beaumont and Fletcher bibliography is naturally the longest, having 1628 + entries to 676 + in that of Massinger and 668 + in that of Chapman.

It is rather strange that no mention of Sir Aston Cokaine is found in either the B. & F. or the Massinger bibliography, but the most frequent omissions are of works which concern the minor writers who are supposed to have collaborated in some of the Beaumont and Fletcher plays. Unlisted, for instance, is Miss Roberta Brinkley's *Nathan Field, The Actor-Playwright* (Yale Studies in English, No. LXXVII), where fifty pages are devoted to Field's participation in B. & F. plays, nor is there mention of C. W. Stork's efforts to distinguish between the styles of Fletcher and Rowley (*William Rowley*, etc., Publ. of U. of Pa., Series in Philology and Literature, XIII, 1910), nor the attempt of Miss Wiggan (Radcliffe College Monographs, No. 9, 1897). The most obvious omission of all, however, is probably Peter Alexander's "Conjectural History of Shakespeare's *Henry VIII.*" *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, xvi (1931), 85-120, where a strong case is presented against Fletcher's participation in that play.

The B. & F. bibliography, at least, seems to have been prepared with haste and to have been poorly proof-read. Charles Elton Norton has become C. E. Morton, appearing under *M* in both index and bibliography. The same work is listed in the bibliography as by B. E. Bogan (977) and B. E. Brogan (1012), and the index cites both spellings as though they were different people. E. S. Landsey's "The Music of the Songs of Fletcher's Plays," is cited as appearing in *Studies in Philology*, "22: 226-233 Apr. 1925." On these pages, however, is found Robert Withington's note on *The Faithful Shepherdess*, "F. S.—Which is to Say . . .," not cited by Dr. Tannenbaum. Landsey's article appeared the year before, the correct reference being 21: 325-355, April 1924. Again, "Sedding" in Item 1487 should, of course, be Spedding. Miss Sibley's *Lost Plays and Masques* (Entry 1467) appeared not in 1833 but in 1933, and in Entry 1276 the essential 1936 is omitted after "*TLS* June 6."

Quite misleading are the two entries dealing with Rymer (1433

and 1212). In both there are references by pages to his discussions of *King and No King* and *The Maid's Tragedy*; there is no suggestion that he discussed *Rollo* at even greater length.

Finally it was an error to include in a B. and F. bibliography Item 1079, Raymond Delacourt's note "Commission to Fletcher and Shakespeare" The note mentions Lawrence and a William Fletcher, but has nothing to do with John. Likewise Item 1309 concerns Phineas Fletcher, the only mention of John being the statement that Phineas was his cousin

In spite of such minor errors as I have noted, the bibliographies will be of great assistance to all students of Elizabethan dramatists.

BALDWIN MAXWELL

University of Iowa

Sir William D'avenant Poet Laureate and Playwright-Manager
By ARTHUR H NETHERCOT University of Chicago Press,
1938. Pp. viii + 488. \$4 00.

Professor Nethercot strikes a nice balance. He displays D'avenant's energy without magnifying his parts or exalting his character, and without exaggeration of his literary gifts convinces us of his importance. To be sure, this has long been understood by students of the seventeenth century, but Mr Nethercot's book will both widen the basis of their understanding and extend it to a larger circle of readers. For his account of the Oxford vintner's son who became in the early years of the Restoration the chief figure of the English theatre and, for better or worse, put operatic scenery onto our legitimate stage, is set forth in a style admirably in keeping with its lively subject. No doubt the writer on Milton must pull a sober face, but there is no reason why a biographer of D'avenant should. This is a gay book, but its gaiety is in perfect harmony with its scholarship.

It presents the results of a thorough and mature investigation. New or neglected documents have yielded interesting genealogical and biographical facts. The knightly founder of the Heroic school was subject to the vexations of humdrum existence in a world whose tailors insist on being paid, as well as to sojourns, exciting or boring, in the Tower of London. Under Mr. Nethercot's escort, he joins the select company of those English poets who killed their man. D'avenant's victim was only a servant, and in time (though it was a long time) he had his pardon of the king who signed the attainder of Strafford. But this murder (for, however offensive may have been its merely verbal provocation, that is what it was) will remain less damaging to Sir William's reputation than the de-

liberate and repeated atrocities he committed on Shakespeare's poetry in his notorious adaptations

His sinfulness is still irritating because, unlike Otway, he was a complacent improver, but Mr Nethercot shows that, in whatever sense the laurel may have gone to D'avenant's head, complacency is not the key to the brilliant career of "such an oddity." D'avenant knew what he wanted to do, and, interrupted though he was by a civil war and a Puritan dictatorship, at long last he did it. When the town began calling Lisle's tennis court "the Opera," and flocking there, a very remarkable victory had been won. If it is the victory that makes D'avenant important, it is his protracted fight for it that gives him his touch of nobility, to which, without letting it obscure the comic side, Mr. Nethercot has done full justice.

HAZELTON SPENCER

Hengist, King of Kent; or The Mayor of Queenborough. By THOMAS MIDDLETON. Edited by R. C. BALD. Folger Shakespeare Library Publications. New York and London Scribner's, 1938. Pp. lxii + 136.

Once more Professor Bald has earned the gratitude of scholars with another carefully edited play by Middleton, one of several seventeenth-century dramatists who remain, after the century of praise that has followed their rediscovery, still unfurnished with seriously established and thoroughly annotated texts. Few of them are in a state more parlous than the author of *Hengist*, as we are now to call it. Dyce was well enough in his day, and his notes (as far as they go) laid well the foundation of glossarial and allusive commentary, but Bullen's editorial efforts were, as usual, negligible from any point of view. In a foreword, the general editor of these Publications sounds the tocsin now, Dr. Adams evidently feels, is the time for all good men to come to the aid of the Middletonian party, not necessarily by editing him (that might well be left to Mr Bald, if he would submit to the yoke), but by preparatory attacks on the various problems, biographical and bibliographical.

Mr Bald's latest contribution is less a definitive edition of the play than a partially corrected edition of the Folger's Lambarde manuscript of it, "a much fuller, and a much better, text than that supplied by the quarto of 1661." In the editor's opinion the hand is that of the scribe responsible for the manuscript owned by the present Duke of Portland. Textual variants appear at the foot of the page. The annotation is illuminating but might be fuller. The valuable introduction does not assert that all problems have been

solved Some may never be. Mr. Bald is confident that the piece is a work of Middleton's maturity For this the strongest evidence is stylistic, and somewhat risky. Whether Middleton built on an old play remains in doubt. Mr. Bald thinks revision likelier than collaboration

Everyone who has concluded that Shakespeare lacked originality because he borrowed his plots should be condemned to read *Hengist* once a week till he is cured. For the source of this comical-historical-tragical drama is also mainly Holinshed, but Middleton fails to manipulate his selected materials with any precision, and the piece sadly lacks clarity, despite the desperate recourse to dumbshows and to Polychronicon Higden as chorus-presenter in the manner of Gower in *Pericles* Nor is the sloppy technique compensated for by much imagination, the action is rarely stirring and never exalting, and not a single one of the chief tragic characters really comes to life. No wonder the piece has long been known by its subtitle, from the comic underplot

In the course of his labors with the text and its sources, Mr. Bald has found much to admire in this messy, uninspired play, but in the opinion of this reviewer there is no reason to revise the unfavorable verdict successively handed down by Ward, Symons, and Ellis "It is surprising," says Mr. Bald,

how often the mind automatically turns to Shakespeare to interpret what Middleton was trying to do in his latest, and greatest, works [This] seems to throw into relief what is best in his work [though] the similarity is often of kind rather than of quality

Well, it is by the quality as well as by the kind that an artist is judged, and the quality of this is pretty feeble. Mr. Bald hazards more than was required when he invites us to compare *Hengist* with *Lear* and *Macbeth*. Not that he is not as conscious as anyone of the gulf between; but the difference is not merely that Vortiger "is altogether of lesser calibre than Macbeth." There is simply no basis of comparison, neither in quality nor in kind. Both usurpers are ambitious, if they were not, they would not be usurpers But Vortiger, admittedly the best character in Middleton's play, is a third-rate Machiavel, while Horsus is a fourth-rate Malcontent

But it would not be fair to proceed without more quotation than space allows from the play and from its editor's reasons for liking it. Certainly Mr. Bald has filed the strongest possible brief. Though dissent is inevitable on aesthetic grounds, not much is likely to be entered on any others, least of all on textual

HAZELTON SPENCER

The Family of the Barrett By JEANETTE MARKS New York:
The Macmillan Company, 1938. Pp xxii + 709. \$5

When Sir Frederic G Kenyon challenged that "Nothing is to be gained by trying to trace back the genealogy of the Barrett family," Miss Marks accepted the challenge. This acceptance resulted in *The Family of the Barrett*, 709 pages all abristle with genealogical information,—confutation enough, perhaps too much, of Sir Frederic.

Apparently Miss Marks has sifted with scholarly care every scrap of Jamaican record of the Barrett family deed books, wills, colonial state papers, public records. Sifting completed and information assembled, Miss Marks faced two tasks to create a readable, significant document from the mass of legalistic, somewhat Saharan facts, to reject facts of little or no relevance in explaining the one person who called this book into being, Elizabeth Barrett Browning. As a desultory history of Jamaica—with its earthquakes, hurricanes, pirates, and gay, careless life—the book is readable and, perhaps, significant. The Barretts lived on Jamaica; all things Jamaican, therefore, become significant. One reflects, however, that the history of Jamaica has been recorded elsewhere. Documents specifically pertaining to the Tittle family (Browning's ancestors on his mother's side) and the Barrett family are more to the point. Here, however, in one important instance, Miss Marks by strained inference concludes that Robert Browning's ancestry was "touched with the tar-brush." This reviewer thinks that Miss Marks's facts tend to confute Miss Marks's inference.

Because hard-earned facts are difficult to jettison, the present "ship" is cluttered almost to foundering with inessential or only slightly essential information. The forebears of E. B. B., the cousins of the forebears of E. B. B. with legitimate and miscegenated ramifications no end, the neighbors of the forebears and of the cousins of E. B. B., magistrates, missionaries and traders of Jamaica, estate owners along with the servants and slaves of the forebears, cousins, magistrates, missionaries, traders, and estate owners are all called to witness over a period of one hundred and ninety years that the actions of Edward Moulton-Barrett on the night of September 20, 1846 (elopement night for E. B. and R. B.) were monomaniacal expressions generated remotely by heritage and more immediately by "twenty years of loss and disaster." So many witnesses could hardly be expected to speak to the point. Miss Marks succeeds in illuminating the character of E. B. B.'s father but she admits that the misguided destruction of E. B. B.'s letters to her father removed "the final evidence which would have made it impossible to crystallize the slander which has centered around the figure of Edward Moulton-Barrett and his daughter."

Miss Marks deserves praise for eliminating the necessity of further work on the Barrietts' genealogy

K. L. KNICKERBOCKER

Rhode Island State College

Latemische Dichtung in England vom Ausgang des Frühhumanismus bis zum Regierungsantritt Elisabeths Untersuchung zur Nationalen und Religiösen Grundlegung des Englischen Humanismus. VON WOLFGANG MANN. Halle (Saale) Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1939. Pp. iv + 208. R. M. 10 or 11 50.

Although there are several studies of the later Latin poetry of Italy, Germany, and France, this is the first systematic history of the Latin verse of Renaissance England. It has, as a consequence, all the minor faults of a pioneer work. The dates of the study are rather arbitrary and necessitate the sawing in half of some poets who reached the top of their achievement after 1558. If literary termini must coincide with political events, the study might better have ended with 1625. The second title of the book indicates Mann's ideological commitment, and at times one feels that he pushes the goad of nationalism a little too strenuously. He is also unaware—since he relies on Warton—of motifs current in English literature, many an idea that he thinks peculiar to the later Latins is an artistic commonplace. Finally, there are errors of commission and omission that one finds in any *Bahnbrechend* work.

Mann inaugurates his study with a survey of the poetry of Fleming, Opicius, and Constable. He provides us with a good account of the poetry evoked by the controversy over Horman's *Vulgaria*, and then turns to an extensive consideration of the greater poets—More, Leland, Chalonier, Shepreve, Parkhurst, and Haddon. He observes with justice that these men were poets by avocation and specialists in politics by vocation. This, of course, is the reason for their national bias.

For the student of English literature the section on More will have the greatest interest; it is the best study of More's Latin verse since Canon Marsden's *Philomorus*. Mann points out that More was able to write of the ordinary events of life in an effortless antique style and that his renderings from Greek are marked by a simplicity which was an essential part of More's character. He detects in these early verses of More the guiding principles of the martyr's life—his love of animals, his high regard for women, his common sense, and his domestic affections. For a premonstration of More's later attitudes Mann recommends a study of More's

epigrams and the *In suscepti Diadematis diem Henrici Octavi*. He is particularly astute in observing that More's humanism and theology never conflicted, that they were parallel but separate mental strains.

The verses of each Latin poet are similarly described and the reader is provided with a liberal number of illustrations. Mann is often prolix and one can quarrel at times with his taste, but one is forced to admit that this book was needed and that it is done with reasonable care

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Duke University

Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey By EDWIN CASADY. New York
Modern Language Association of America, 1938. Pp. xii +
257.

On seeing that this work is sponsored by the Modern Language Association and being told in the first sentence of the preface that its purpose is "to reinterpret the character of the man and of his poetry," one expects a study of Henry Howard as a poet. But the book represents the current tendency of literary scholars to have little to do with poetry, and to pass on to the facts of history and biography. The only extended discussion of Surrey's poetry is—symbolically—in an appendix. At the best the appendix is an attempt to escape from the merely chronological method Mr. Casady has imposed on himself, which, with its careful documentation from *Dom Cal.* and other indispensable sources,¹ forms a cage hard to break out of. But if we are to know the hero, the author must cut his way out and write considerable sections in which the man and his qualities are discussed. That might make the book longer, but a view of the attitude to Italian art of this noble and soldier would be worth having. What beyond display was in the mind of Surrey when he probably sent the Italian architect to Mount Surrey?

Mr. Casady most nearly escapes from chronology in giving us the account of his hero as Lieutenant General at Boulogne. The period of Sept 1545—March 1546 is allotted 42 pages, in which the difficulties of an inadequately supported commander appear. Moreover, some scattered attempts to characterize the man are given; the best is: "Surrey, in spite of his love of action, was prudent and cautious in military affairs. He could order and lead headlong charges when the best strategy was boldness. Nevertheless, he sought to accomplish his object with the least possible risk and cost, without unnecessarily exposing his men to danger" (p. 151). Less informing

¹ On pp 10, 11, Thomas Brotherton appears both as illegitimate son of Edward I, and as son of Edward and Margaret of France

is this. "Surrey, true to his usual method, had deployed his men in a strategic position" (p. 153). We should like to know what his strategic conceptions were. Further development of Howard's military prudence would have gone far to support Mr. Casady's contention that his hero was not "foolish proud."

Such support is needed, for on the author's own showing Surrey was not always prudent, or other than proud. He quarrelled publicly with his sister over a matter that should have been kept private (p. 180); he built and furnished a house beyond his means; he even indulged in sophomoric window-smashing in London. Indeed the reader gets the impression that Surrey was fully mature and prudent only as poet and soldier.

Surrey the poet is presented in Mr. Casady's appendix as a writer of "polite" verse, except in his translations from the Bible, to which astonishing originality is assigned. The Psalms have been applied by so many men to their own situations that it is difficult to believe this prisoner much different from the others. A suggestion that Surrey learned blank verse from Luigi Alamanni is unfortunately put (p. 235), it is hardly possible that Mr. Casady has not carefully examined a volume he makes so important, yet he quotes from Henry Morley's account of the *Opere Toscane* and gives no internal details to support his view.²

A pleasant passage on London and the Thames, disinterred from *Archæologia* and quoted on p. 108, concludes. "Never did I see a river so thickly covered with swans as this."

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

Sir Walter Scott, Bart By SIR HERBERT J. C. GRIERSON. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 320. \$4.50.

Sir Herbert was foreordained to write this biography as the culmination of the Scott Centenary. As editor of the all-embracing edition of Scott's *Letters* (1932-1937) he is necessarily more familiar than anyone else with the newly available letters tangential to Scott, with the vast collection of letters to Scott in the generous hands of Sir Hugh Walpole and with the flood of books and articles in the space of 1932. Since 1837 all studies of Scott have been based upon Lockhart's biography. With the labors of Sir Herbert Scott studies must take a new start.

Lockhart is not likely to be superseded, but he was careless in the use of his material. Professor Grierson recognizes this in full measure, for he says at the start, "The aim of the present biography is . . . not to rival Lockhart . . . but rather to supplement." And

² For discussion of blank verse in Alamanni's shorter poems see Henri Hauvette, *Luigi Alamanni*, Paris 1903, pp. 215-25.

the present book is in very truth a supplement While Professor Grierson has told the whole story, even though much of it is in outline, he has expanded out of absolute proportion those parts of Scott's life for which he can offer new material He does this especially in regard to three subjects Scott's early love for Williamina Belsches, the early life of Charlotte Carpenter, and Scott's business complications

Of Scott's love for Williamina, Sir Herbert gives an even fuller account than he does in his article in *Blackwood's Magazine* (1937). He recognizes to some extent the effect of Scott's disappointment upon his "irritable and ungovernable mind", but he fails, I think, to give full credit to it in the tremendous activities which followed and in the swift wooing of Miss Carpenter He also misses, I think, the implications of the deep emotions with which Scott renews friendly relations with Williamina's mother in 1827 (See the *Journal* and W Partington, *Sir Walter Scott's Post-bag, More stories*, etc., 1932, pp 230-3) The point has its importance for it seems to show a deeper passion than Scott's biographers have revealed The account of the early history of Charlotte Carpenter has all the interest of a detective story One can only hope that some of the conjectural points may ultimately be cleared up, even though complete documentation would do little to illuminate Scott himself Of the financial complications the book contains much. The whole business has always been confusing Even after the story as told by Sir Herbert with the aid of his accountant friend, James Glen, it is still confusing to the lay mind. But we shall probably never know more about the interlocking relationships of James and John Ballantine, Constable, Cadell, etc. with Scott and of Scott with them. The general conclusion is that Scott was not the victim of unscrupulous partners but was more than a little to blame for the mess into which all fell. He was irresistibly driven on by his desire for wealth and land, all the time keeping his business affairs secret from his closest friends and family.

The volume hardly presents a breathing portrait of Scott, yet it is full of wise and acute comment upon both his character and his work It deplores his secretiveness, his intemperate politics, his worldliness, his lack of deep insight, but it is quick to recognize his sweetness, his loyalties, his spontaneity, his essential nobleness The main thesis is, perhaps, the unfortunate dualism seen in life and work, a dualism of romantic imagination on the one hand and of a sense of reality on the other, the two rarely reconciled Yet it was Scott's sense of reality which made his greatest contributions to his time, namely, an "epoch-making impulse" towards "historical humanism" and a series of unforgettable characters "governed by simple and elemental feelings."

HORACE AINSWORTH EATON

Syracuse University

New Poetry of New England, Frost and Robinson. By ROBERT P TRISTRAM COFFIN Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp xvi + 148 \$2.00.

These six lectures, delivered a year ago at The Johns Hopkins University on the Percy Graeme Turnbull Foundation, are now made available to a larger audience than the lecturer's voice could reach. They should command the attention of all who believe in poetry. No more understanding interpretation of the two leading American poets of our time has been written.

Mr. Coffin speaks as a poet commenting on poetry, as a New Englander appraising the New England spirit. Unlike Amy Lowell, who was also a poet and a New Englander and who wrote on Robinson and Frost some twenty years ago, he is able to approach the work of his contemporaries without preconceptions. He brings to his subject an unfailing supply of vitality, flexibility, good sense, and wholesome, contagious enthusiasm. One does not feel that these chapters are formal lectures, but rather the words of a man talking on matters of intimate concern, and that is the tone best adapted to a discussion of Frost and Robinson.

The new poetry of New England is first projected against a background of the old. The poets of the mid-nineteenth century, as Mr. Coffin rightly holds, were full of the confidence of a period of prosperity and expansion. But he does not distinguish sharply enough between those like Longfellow who sought to bring traditional genteel culture to the New World and those like Emerson who fostered what was tough, individualistic, and native to the soil. The distinction is important since Robinson may truly be regarded as the last voice of the waning genteel tradition, whereas Frost stands clearly in the line of writers whose sources were interior and hence independent. Emerson and Emily Dickinson are his predecessors. Mr. Coffin as a coast of Maine man realizes very clearly the difference between big-house and small-house New Englanders, and vividly associates Robinson with the decay of the former, "lost and lonely people," he finely calls them, "shells that change of times has thrown out of their element, to bleach out into ghastly patterns of wasted, if beautiful design." But he is less at home in New Hampshire, Vermont, and western Massachusetts, where there were few mansions to decay, and his perception of the vigorous, indigenous, and continuing tradition of back-country New England, neither big-house nor small-house, is correspondingly less sure. It is from that tradition, however, that Frost may be said to derive.

Mr. Coffin describes and illustrates with effective examples the unseating of poetic rhetoric, the simplification of the language of poetry, that both Robinson and Frost accomplished. He draws an

excellent contrast between the baffling questions against which Robinson vainly flung himself and the little, concrete certainties of things and beliefs that Frost was content to pile up until they amounted to answers. Probably Mr Coffin intended to devote his lectures to the two poets equally, but toward the end it is Frost who dominates the discussion. There may be doubt as to which poet was the greater master of expression, but there can be none as to which was, and is, the incomparable master of the art of living

GEORGE F WHICHER

Amherst College

Linee di una storia della critica al "Decameron" con bibliografia boccaccesca completamente aggiornata. By VITTORE BRANCA.
 Roma Soc. An. Ed. Dante Alighieri, 1939 187 pp Bibloteca della Rassegna, XXIII

The survey and analysis of that body of critical opinion and attitude which several centuries may bring to bear on a particular literary masterpiece is the very groundwork which our general histories of criticism, to their own detriment, have too often foregone in their haste for synthesis. If well done, such a study in history is bound to touch on problems of a more general scope, and interest scholars whose primary concern is not with the particular author under consideration. One is reminded that such studies for even the major figures in Italian literature are still lacking in any complete sense. Where can we turn today for a satisfactory survey of the criticism of any one of the major figures or masterpieces of Italian literature? Even the first bibliographical step is, in most cases, yet to be taken, and in not a few, if that step has been made, it has remained its own excuse.

The outline of Decameron criticism for which we can now thank Mr. Branca's patience and discrimination, and which forms the first half of his volume (pp 1-71) had already appeared in part under the same title in the review *La Rassegna* (1936-1937). In the volume before us, his survey now stands complete, bringing discussion of the most recent essays and interpretative commentaries on the *Decameron* down to the present year.

There may be little in the way of startling revelation to be noticed in the panorama of criticism which we are thus invited to contemplate. Nothing, indeed, for anyone generally acquainted with the outlines of literary opinion in Europe from Boccaccio's day to the Romantics. That this observation can be made of Branca's study in no way invalidates it. It will not be easy to charge him with serious lacunae, and in general, his discernment

and analysis of a particular point of view on Boccaccio's work, as well as the place to which that view is assigned in the general parade of opinion, seems valid beyond serious question. This, and not the injection of interest where interest was frankly not to be found, was precisely his business as historian.

The history of Decameron criticism before the 18th century seems to have been a comparatively easy task. The inflexible position of the humanist, the linguist and the legislator of standards has to our eyes an outline so clear that almost by itself it may be said to fall into its proper place. It is after the general ferment of ideas brought by the 18th and early 19th centuries that the labeling of attitude and the relative genealogy of opinion becomes a more complicated task, requiring of the historian something more than the patience needed to search out and catalogue this criticism (which stands in this case, as direct source to that of our day). It is in this and the subsequent period, when literary opinion more closely approaches or coincides with what we now call *criticism*, that its historian is obliged to take stock of his own view as to the meaning of that word. Branca has not kept us in the dark in this respect. When he begins to find, in the famous *Discorso storico* by Foscolo, what can rightly bear the name of criticism, it is plain from the following observation just what criterion will guide him in his analysis of the modern chapter which Foscolo opens.

Nasce col Foscolo la sola critica letteraria degna di questo nome perché comincia ad acquistare dignità, nella comprensione più piena della sua funzione specifica. Sorge non più occasionalmente da interessi che hanno un vincolo solo formale con l'opera d'arte (interesse linguistico, filologico, storico, didattico) ma dal desiderio di meglio comprendere la vita poetica dell'opera. In questo nuovo interesse si inseriscono anche gli altri che prima avevano dominato la critica, e solo dipendendo da questo atteggiamento critico centrale, possono ancora vivere e diventano, a loro volta, momenti secondari di esso" (p. 39).

In his survey of criticism after Foscolo and particularly after De Sanctis, the reader is inclined to regret that Branca did not indulge in more detail. There is no good reason to question his view that the two problems which remain central in modern interpretations of the masterpiece (the unity of the work, and its relation as art to the minor works, p. 61) have not as yet received adequate solution. Indeed these problems are still very much with us; and for that very reason, every reader who may have his own particular theory in the matter, will variously question the particular evaluation of opinion of more recent character. Our desire for more discussion at this point is good evidence of the immediacy of these problems, but our desire arises also from a feeling, (much to the credit of Branca's discussion) that this young historian and critic has something more to contribute to the history of criticism than

the record of it. We are encouraged from this survey to hope that the author will now turn to a contribution which will make rather than record history in this field

The Bibliografia boccaccesca which completes the volume is a contribution the need of which has been felt since the well-known volume of Traversari (1907). By all checks available to this reviewer, Branca has given us a thorough piece of work. In arrangement of material, he has happily continued the system adopted by Traversari, listing all works alphabetically under the year of appearance, facilitating consultation with two indexes by author and by subject respectively. The detail of the second index is a boon to Boccaccio studies. Additions to Zambrini-Bacchi della Lega in regard to editions of Boccaccio in a *prima parte* and additions to the Traversari bibliography are included. In short, we have here a volume which, with Traversari's, will be considered *the* Boccaccio Bibliography for a good many years to come¹

CHARLES S SINGLETON

Voltaire et l'Encyclopédie. By RAYMOND NAVES. Paris: Les Éditions des Presses modernes, n. d. [1938]. Pp 206.

This is a "petite thèse," complementary to the same author's extensive study of "Le Goût de Voltaire," also published last year. It makes clear the limited nature of Voltaire's collaboration with the *Encyclopédie*. Diderot and Voltaire always remained rather distant and the Patriarch was not invited to write articles of fundamental importance, though he accepted with good grace those assigned to him. On the whole, his collaboration was limited to rather general questions of literature and history. It appears also that Voltaire played a rôle in inspiring articles furnished by the liberal Protestant preacher of Lausanne, Polier de Bottens. "Loin d'avoir été le chef des encyclopédistes," says M. Naves, "Voltaire

¹ A careful check of this work against two recent *Repertori bibliografici* will serve as good warning of the many lacunae the latter inevitably contain. Students are too likely to trust to their completeness.

A few instances of repetition from Traversari are not worth mentioning since they are slips which can do no harm. Several additions could be made to Branca's lists no doubt. Without pretending to completeness in detecting lacunae, the following examples might be cited (with thanks, in some cases, to Prof. Fucilla of Northwestern University from whose bibliography of miscellanies now in preparation they were kindly put at my disposal).

V. Piccoli, *Anime e ombre*, Milano, Treves, 1927 (Boccaccio, pp. 64-70), A. Zottoli, *La novella del marchese di Saluzzo*, La Cultura, a. IX (1930), pp. 961-88, H. Hauvette, *La Mort Vivante*, Paris, Boivin, 1933, Apollonio, *Uomini e forme*, Firenze, Sansoni, 1934 (Boccaccio, 354-61), G. Grasselli, *Spunti critici*, Reggio Emilia, Giardetti, 1936 (Il Decamerone, pp. 8-13.)

n'a été que leur franc-tueur, mais à leur service il a pris tout à fait conscience de lui-même" (p. 166)

When therefore the *Encyclopédie* was suppressed in 1759, Voltaire became definitely convinced that it was impossible to publish under the nose of the authorities anything sufficiently independent to be worth while. He held too that the large number of collaborators of uneven merit doomed the work inevitably to mediocrity or timidity. Finally, he thought that the *Encyclopédie* was too bulky to work effectively upon mass opinion. In short, M. Naves believes that the chief impetus for Voltaire's *Dictionnaire philosophique*, which was at the beginning intended to be "portatif," came from the suppression, and, as Voltaire saw it, the comparative failure of these big folios edited by Diderot and D'Alembert. The very title of the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*, later fused with the *Dictionnaire philosophique*, shows clearly whence it sprang. Thus the influence of the *Encyclopédie* was of great importance in turning much of Voltaire's later activity in the direction of the various alphabetical writings which he found an effective means of working upon contemporary opinion.

The author has made careful use of manuscript materials in Geneva and in the private collection of M. Henri Monod at Morges relative to Polier de Bottens. The Appendix gives the variants between Voltaire's articles as they appeared in the *Encyclopédie* and as published in the *Dictionnaire philosophique*.

Finally, M. Naves' study constitutes an important contribution to our detailed knowledge of the relations between Voltaire and Diderot.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

The Ohio State University

Nominal Compounds in Germanic By CHARLES T. CARR. St. Andrews University Publications, No. XLI. Oxford University Press 1939. Pp. xv + 497.

This book treats of the nominal compounds in the Old Germanic dialects (Gothic, Old Norse, Old English, Old Saxon, Old High German and Old Frisian). It is not a mere compilation, but goes into the nature and character of the Germanic compounds thoroughly and comprehensively.

After a brief introduction on the theory of the compound, the author discusses his theme under three main divisions. 1. The Stock of Compounds in Gothic and West Germanic, subdivided into, a) Inter-Germanic Borrowings, b) The Primitive Germanic Compounds; c) Parallel and Independent Formations in the Germanic Languages; d) The West Germanic Compounds, e) Parallel and Independent Formations in the West Germanic Languages.

The compounds under the last four subdivisions are treated as the usual types of Copulatives, Determinatives and Exocentrics. The second main division treats of the Structure of the Compounds, such as the types and their development, the Morphology, the Composition Vowel, Secondary Compounds, Semantic Types, to which is added a chapter on Intensifying Compounds and Composition Suffixes. The third main division takes up the Germanic Compounds in Prose and Poetry, to which is also added a chapter on the Survival of Poetic Compounds in Middle English and Middle High German. Nominal compounds with an adverbial and prepositional prefix and compound verbs are reserved for a later volume.

The book that Carr has presented is a worthy contribution and is perhaps the first attempt to treat one branch of the Indo-European family of languages exhaustively in the matter of nominal compounds. To be sure the compounds in the Germanic languages have an importance, particularly in alliterative verse, which is not shared by those in other branches of the Indo-European family. It is a regrettable fact that we have as yet no history of Indo-European nominal composition, the lack of an exhaustive study of such compounds in Latin is especially deplorable. The reviewer believes that the more or less unsatisfactory chapter in Carr, page 237 ff., on the 'Second Part of the Compounds Declined Differently from the Simplex' would have profited by such 'Vorarbeiten'.

Comments p 10, the form *evnchoran(ero)* '*anachoretarum*' of the Benedictiner Regel was probably influenced by the past participle (*ga*)*choran* of (*ga*)*chuisan*, p. 68, line 8 from top (cf. also p 274, note 2) with regard to *Vagdavercustis* cf. Collitz, *Das Schwache Präteritum*, p. 77, note 1, p 70, s v. *aurtigards*, dogmatic statements such as here are frequently met with (cf. pp 72, 3, 101, 71), p. 73, 2 originally rather a translation of *regnum caelorum* (cf. βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν), p 122, 11, cf. Wissmann, *Nomina Postverbalia*, p 115 ff, p. 148, 8 OHG *nuichomen*, *nuiquemo* may be influenced by Latin *novicius* and *advena*, p 149, 2 OHG *alenamo* cf. Latin adj. *omninominis* (*omninominus*); p 170, line 7 from bottom, OHG *munouga* is probably a loan-translation from Latin *nonoculus*, p 172, line 1 from bottom, MHG *schaber-nack* hardly belongs here (cf. Gotze, *Trubners Deutsches Wörterbuch*), p. 205, line 1 from top an *änderwisa* is perhaps to be deduced from *geänderwisonne* N I, 360, 5, line 16 from top, add *êrest-worðen* N. II, 449, 1, p. 249, line 13 ff from bottom, cf. Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, p 210, 4, p 288, the compound adjectives with *-môd* as the second element retain the stem vowel as those in *-lic* (cf. p. 296), p 303, line 9 from top, *eldi* (*eldibarn*) is a plurale tantum, and retains the plural ending *i*, or is reduced from the gen. *eldeo* (cf. *ludibarn*, pp. 313, 316, 458); line 15 from top, there is no form *wurgscapu* in *Heland* C 3692, the MS has *wurðgiscapu*, the stroke through the shaft of the *ð* is by a later hand; p. 317, 15 the *Heland* MSS usually write the two members of compounds

separately, it is also common practice in OHG MSS, 318, line 3 from top, words are often written separately, but with one main stress, cf. *dæges ēage* = daisy, p. 324, line 6 from bottom, a *goshawk* is hardly a 'hawk like a goose, but a 'hawk flown at geese', p. 332, 3 (cf. 382, 4), the matter of old Germanic tautological compounds is rather difficult for us to-day to appraise correctly, except perhaps where one element is a foreign word, a tautological compound is often not simply one whose parts mean the same thing, the reviewer believes that the Goth felt *þrumagus* as a 'servant who is a boy' (cf. English 'man-servant, maid-servant'), despite the fact that Greek *παῖς* is also rendered by *magus*, the latter could then be an ellipsis or a slavish translation. Likewise Old Saxon *benwunda* (p. 333) is most likely more than a mere 'wound,' it is a 'dangerous wound, a wound that might cause death,' etc., p. 357, line 14 from bottom, the statement that 'there seems to be no reason—why *unmetgrôt* (*Heland* 3299, 4329) and *unmethêt* (*Heland* 3437) should not be considered as compounds' is not correct in view of the metrical exigencies of alliterative poetry line 3299 *thoh hre sî unmet grôt* is a B-verse (similarly 3437) and as such requires two words, line 4329 *ferd unmet grôt* is a D-verse, and the phrase *unmet grôt* could be written as one word, but there is no reason for such inconsistent writing, especially as the words are separated in the MSS, pages 398-401. To say that Notker was 'apparently dissatisfied' with his coinings of new words to render his Latin original and for that reason varied them is difficult to prove. It has been the reviewer's habit to question new word-formations as original coinings without some suggestion from the Latin. In many instances words and phrases in the commentaries are the source of a compound noun; p. 398, 12 ff., cf. Henrici, *Die Quellen von Notkers Psalmen*, pp. 299-300, p. 399, line 7 from top, *michelwerchunga* probably suggested by *magna faciens* of the Commentary (cf. Henrici, p. 86), p. 399, line 11 from bottom, cf. Henrici, p. 353 *psalmus quippe cantus est* for *psalmosang*, p. 399, line 9 from bottom, for *frôsang*, cf. Henrici, p. 87 *laeta decantat*, p. 410, line 6 from top, *burger* probably suggested by *porta civitatis*, Henrici, p. 336; pages 423-448. It is a difficult, if not precarious, undertaking to try to evaluate Old Germanic poetry, and particularly on just one phase of that poetry, namely the compound nouns. What a work may lose by non-adherence to the Old Tradition, it may gain in some other respect. The *Heland* and *Genesis* are absolutely Christian in spirit and as such there may be a conscious attempt to avoid those very points which the Old English and Old Norse poets consider as essential elements of their style and 'Weltanschauung,' a fact that may bring with it an indifference to important characteristics when they add little or nothing to a new trend, which is, however, not yet able to divest itself of the old traditional practice entirely. Otfrid took this last step. On the other hand the Cynewulfian poetry is still in the grip of a

strong tradition, which was lacking on the Continent. To say therefore that the *Heland* has no synonymus terms for war is otiose, since warlike scenes are lacking and Christian ethics demands their suppression. It had been already stated by Philostorgios that *Wulfila* had omitted the translation of the *Books of Kings* because they contained the history of wars. This view is partially born out by Carr's own remarks, p. 448, 1 ff. "It is in keeping with the sombre character of the poem and the poet's predominant interest in evil and sin that he finds nine compounds to describe aspects of hell (*baluwiti*, *ferndalu*, *helledor*, *helligithwing*, *hellfiur*, *hellgrund*, *hellporta*, *hellwiti*, *helsid*)". In other words, the *Heland* is no typical, Old Germanic epic, it is Christian, and one should not therefore over-emphasize the paucity of Germanic heroic concepts. Despite this failing, the *Heland* has for the reviewer more 'Schwung' than some of the Cynewulfian works. Page 450, note 1, the view that the *Heland* and *Genesis* were written by the same poet has not been entirely abandoned (cf. Wilhelm Bruckner, *Die altsächsische Genesis und der Heland, das Werk eines Dichters*, Berlin, 1929).

Misprints p. 14, line 12 from top, read *weroldwelo*, p. 28, line 17 from bottom, correct 'Reallexikon' IV, 60, p. 68, line 12 from top, read 'Schonfeld' (cf. p. 274, note 2), p. 162, line 19 from top, read became for began, p. 164, line 4 from bottom, read *rāja-putrás*, son, p. 177, line 3 from bottom, read *alfeibrennopher*, p. 302, line 6 from top, insert out after points, p. 322, line 5 from top, read *sunbyrne*, p. 349, line 16 from top, read *Walhallklange*, p. 382, line 15 from bottom, read *galausida*, p. 384, line 5 from top, read *galugawentwoßs*, p. 409, footnote 1, read *althochdeutschen*, p. 411, line 15 from bottom, read *magnificentia*, p. 425, note 2, read Die Gruppe ist, p. 426, last line, read B-lines, p. 460, line 11 from bottom, read: *balesyßes*, p. 5, line 5 from bottom, read *παιδαγωγός*, p. 155, line 7 from top, read *πενταδάκτυλος*, p. 210, line 6 from top, read *αίμορροῦσα*, p. 305, line 9 from bottom, read *ἀλιπόρφυρος*, p. 355, line 3 from top, read *ὀλοκαύτωμα*, p. 381, line 15 from bottom, read *εἰκών*, p. 381, line 5 from bottom, read *ἀναχαῖον*, p. 381, line 1 from bottom, read *φίλαντοι*, p. 382, line 1 from top, read *βασιλείον*, p. 382, line 12 from top, read *σαλπίζειν*; p. 383, line 18 from bottom, read *νυμφίος*, p. 383, line 2 from bottom, read *ὀλοκαύτωμα*, p. 383, note, read *εἶδωλον*, p. 384, line 8 from top, read *ψεύδο-*, p. 384, lines 10 and 11 from top, read: *εὐλογία*, p. 384, lines 12 and 17 from top, read *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*; p. 384, line 14 from bottom, read *ἀλλογενής*, p. 384, line 12 from bottom, read *συγγενής*, p. 384, line 3 from bottom, read *φρεναπατῆ*; p. 385, line 5 from top, read *οἰκοδεσπότης*; p. 385, line 10 from top, read *ὀλιγόψυχος*, p. 385, line 11 from top, read *χειροποίητος* (this word is also wrongly accented in Streitberg's Glossary), p. 385, line 14 from bottom, read *ὑπερήφανος*, p. 385, line 11 from bottom, read *αὐτόπητης*, p. 385, line 3 from bottom, read *εὐεργεσία*, p. 386,

line 13 from top, read κῆπος, p. 386, line 17 from top, read κῆνσος, p. 386, line 12 from bottom, read κλῆμα

EDWARD H. SEHRT

George Washington University

Franz Grillparzer's Political Ideas and "Die Judin von Toledo"

By HAROLD F. H. LENZ Published Privately. New York, 1938 v + 95 pp

In view of the recent trend to regard Grillparzer as baroque, Dr. Lenz's careful analysis of his political ideas is a welcome bit of additional proof that on the basis of these ideas Grillparzer was a humanist and a true son of Weimar. The Lenz monograph consists of two parts. The first dealing with Grillparzer's conception of the state, was published in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XXXVII (1938), No. 2, the second dealing with *Die Judin von Toledo* which the author feels "represents the acid test of the validity of the political key to Grillparzer's works", is published here for the first time.

Dr. Lenz sets out to show that the poet's political views paralleled his *Weltanschauung* and that they are "the most effective approach to his great creations." (P. 2) He shows Grillparzer's adherence to Josephinism and later to Weimarian classicism to have been the mainspring of his political ideas. To this he adds his love of Austria and more specifically of Vienna, as a strong force in Grillparzer's life and work. Basing his conclusions largely on a brief analysis of the three *Nachlass* dramas, *Libussa*, *Die Judin von Toledo* and *Bruderzwist in Habsburg*, the author shows Grillparzer to have been a "pantheist and humanist, a devout disciple and original revaluator of the Weimar classicists, Goethe and Schiller." (P. 29) He rejects the Nadler-Alker view of Grillparzer as baroque (Roselieb too might be mentioned as holding this view) and accepts Cysarz's evaluation of Grillparzer as the mediator between north and south, between Barock and humanism, who grew away from his Austrian heredity and adopted the ideals of humanism. The interpretation of *Die Judin von Toledo* differs from that of other Grillparzer commentators. Dr. Lenz sees in this drama neither the tragedy of the Jewess, nor a paean of the state, nor the development of a man, but rather "the degredation of the individual (Alfonso) in the triumph of the state." (P. 69) His analysis of the various characters whom he divides into the party of the Jewess and the party of the state, is very penetrating, even though this reviewer fails to see any evidence that the shallow Rahel feels "a true love"

for the king That Alfonso does not develop, but that, on the contrary, he loses some of the fine moral attributes of his personality, when he leans figuratively and, at the end, literally on the opportunist Garceran, is the key to this new and well-documented study of *Die Judin*.

Dr Lenz's book is a thoughtful and valid treatment of a difficult subject That he has been able to give an original and, to this reviewer, correct interpretation of *Die Judin* in spite of the many studies made of this drama, is indeed a gratifying contribution to the field of Grillparzer letters

DOROTHY LASHER-SCHLITT

Brooklyn College

Literary Criticism and Romantic Theory in the Work of Achim von Arnim. By HERBERT R LIEDEKE New York Columbia University Press 1937 x + 187 pp

The discussion and evaluation of Achim von Arnim's literary criticism, which this treatise offers, is a welcome contribution to our knowledge of the theory of the younger Romanticists. It is a meritorious task since it has "heretofore been almost completely neglected" and since it digests a widely scattered material, but it is a difficult undertaking since Arnim's views are often somewhat contradictory and not easily interpreted, owing to some "peculiar indefiniteness," which already Brentano criticised.

With an extensive reading and a thorough knowledge of the field, Mr. Liedke presents his subject in nine well documented chapters, of which the fourth (The Heidelberg Circle) and the seventh (The Rise of Nationalism) are perhaps the most important. The fifth (Older Romantic Contemporaries) and the sixth (Classicism) show most clearly one marked weakness of the author's technique, namely his chronological treatment of the subject which mingles biographical data, historical facts, and a theoretical discussion of Arnim's essays and reviews and thus results in constant repetitions and cross references. It is apt to confuse the reader who is at the end left without a systematic synthesis of Arnim's literary theory, for neither the eighth (The Drift toward Realism) nor the ninth chapters (Arnim's Position in the History of Criticism) supply a very extensive summary.

Some attempt should also have been made to analyse more closely in form and thought a few important critical specimens of Arnim's essays, such as his folksong article, which to the uninitiated remains highly cryptic unless the allusions to his hidden focal idea (discussed in chapters I and III) are kept in mind. In this lack of lucidity and presupposition of basic philosophic thought

Arnim not unfrequently reminds us of Friedrich Schlegel's manner and the question arises whether he was not influenced in his beginnings by the older critic's aphoristic style in spite of his (Arnim's) antagonistic feeling

The reviewer felt some doubt in regard to the following generalizations

P 118 "Arnim did not have the ability [to write psychological novels], to delve into the intricacies of emotion and the life of the soul"—*Dolores*, Novellen?

P 152 "These stories, like Tieck's, are purged of fantastic caprice and tend to bear the imprint of realism"—No caprice in *Majoratsherren* and *Invaliden*?

P 152 "Arnim survived the War of Liberation only a few years"—1815-1831?

P 167 "Such a 'Biedermeyer' (sic!) group had gathered around Varnhagen von Ense"—Biedermeier in Rahel's salon?

The Index, conscientiously worked out and comprising, should include references to genres and forms (i.e. sonnet, novel). Such strictures notwithstanding, Mr. Liedke's book cannot be overlooked by students of Romantic theory.

ERNST FEISE

BRIEF MENTION

Dostoevsky's English Reputation (1881-1936). By HELEN MUCHNIC. Northampton, Massachusetts: Smith College, 1938. Pp. vi + 219. \$.75. (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol. XX, Nos. 3 and 4.) The history of a literary reputation mirrors the conscience of an age. Nowhere is this more vividly revealed than in the Victorian reaction to the continental realistic and naturalistic literary movements of the nineteenth century. Balzac, Baudelaire, Flaubert, Zola, Ibsen, Dostoevsky—one after the other—taunted the Victorian tradition with its troubled concern over problems of art and morality. The literature that "brought the mantling blush to the maiden cheek" caught Mrs. Grundy in her most inhibited and sensitive moods. Before the turn of the century, she became a wiser and more tolerant person.

Dostoevsky's literary reputation, to be sure, suffered less from the vituperative bombast heaped upon the earlier realists. The varied and elusive qualities of his work—his "decency," "mysticism," "humanitarianism"—also—softened the blows of his worst enemies. Nevertheless it challenged sufficient controversy to provide Miss Muchnic with fruitful material for her valuable investi-

gation of the temper of this transition period. The early Victorian issues, in modified form and with new phrases, are fought again from 1881-1936. Dostoevsky interested almost every important critic or novelist of these years. Each found somewhere in him a convenient theme on which to play his own aesthetic variations. Thus, although interesting for its own sake, Dostoevsky's reputation provides ample material for the moral and intellectual history of the past fifty years.

The nature of this study requires steady quotation which might very well leave the non-specialist either dizzy or bored, but Miss Muchnic has quoted pointedly and paraphrased skilfully. The writing moves easily, at times dramatically. Miss Muchnic works close to her material, but she never loses an opportunity to prove an essential point, to consider implications, and to suggest related problems for further study. The volume is completely documented (index, bibliography, references). The approach is careful, cautious, inclusive (contains American as well as English criticism)—a splendid example of modern scholarship in its painstaking effort to interpret as well as to reveal the facts of its research.

CLARENCE R. DECKER

The University of Kansas City

Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel, volume two, *The New World*. By EDWARD GODFREY COX. Seattle. University of Washington, 1938. Pp. viii + 591. \$3. (University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature, 10.) *Travel and Literature*. By M. H. BRAAKSMA. Groningen: Wolters, 1938. Pp. iv + 128. F. 2.50. Professor Cox has now published the second valuable volume of his immense guide to travel literature in English before 1800. In addition to listing voyages to the Americas and beyond, and voyages classed as military, naval, and fictitious, Mr. Cox throws in for good measure the names of treatises on geography, cartography, navigation, and the art of travel, and also of bibliographies and secondary works. He promises to take up next the books on travel in the British Isles.

Dr. Braaksma's book is an essay on the appraisal of travel literature, taking for its material the writings of some English travelers to Persia, from Mandeville to Mr. Dos Passos. The conclusion seems to be that travel literature is seldom good literature, being by nature largely dull and mechanical. Witness the contrast between Morier's *Hajji Baba* (which I would myself call a great travel-book) and his more formal *Journeys*. Now it is well to have this critical discussion out in the open, and many readers will doubtless agree that travel literature is good only when it is exciting. This judgment must still seem to me like putting butter in the watch,

and not the best butter either. Travel literature is by nature historical document. Its first function is necessarily to be informative, dull or not. To judge it by its style alone is like calling Mr William Beebe a greater scientific writer than Darwin. The esthetic impressionism of the book is matched by its historical impressionism. One can hardly agree, for example, that Orientalism is a modern invention, when one remembers Megasthenes and the Alexander-legends, or the famous passage on East and West in Giraldus Cambrensis.

GEORGE B. PARKS

Washington University, Saint Louis

Essays and Studies, by members of The English Association (U. P. Branch), Allahabad, 1938. Pp. vi + 179. Price, Rs 2/- This collection contains articles ranging in subject matter from medieval to modern. The paper on Walter De La Mare is perhaps the most sensitive and original, while two on Kipling—one acting as a wholesome corrective for the “bard of the banjo” attitude, the other an examination of the influence of social environment on the poet’s “bubble reputation”—are the most convincing and the best executed.

VARLEY LANG

Geschichte der englischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. By WALTER F. SCHIRMER. Halle, Saale: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1937. Pp. vii + 679. RM 18. Professor Schirmer’s volume is as good a short history of English literature as we now have. It was written primarily for students, but makes profitable reading for specialists as well. The author divides his work into five books. In the first of these (pp. 1-44), he takes up the OE period, to which are devoted eight short chapters; in the first chapter he sketches the historical and cultural background of the period, in the second, the general characteristics of OE literature, in the other six, he considers the various *genres* cultivated during the period. The other four books are subdivided with greater regard to chronology. Book II (110 pp. in length) carries the story down to the death of Chaucer. Books III and IV (133 pp. each) cover the period from 1400 to 1800. Book V (138 pp.) takes up the 19th and 20th centuries. The last two books fall each into two parts, the first part (four chapters) of Book IV is devoted to the 17th, the second part (three chapters) to the 18th century; in Book V, the year 1830 serves as dividing line between the two parts. It will be seen that Schirmer gives relatively more space to medieval times, and relatively less space to modern times, than is customary in English-speaking countries. He uses this space, on the whole, to

good advantage In particular he is to be commended for considering literary monuments written in Latin and French as well as those written in English. His general observations on political and cultural conditions, however, often strike one as a bit out of date and sometimes he even falls into naïveté, as when he takes for historical fact (p. 48) a story of the Golden Age which attached itself to the figure of William the Conqueror.

K M

Some Romance Words of Arabic or Germanic Origin By LESLIE PARKER BROWN. (The University of Southern California Romance Philology Series, Vol. 1) Los Angeles, 1938. Pp. 68. Je regrette de ne pas pouvoir dire beaucoup de bien de cette collection d'articles étymologiques l'auteur n'est pas assez critique vis-à-vis de ses propres associations d'idées Dériver l'esp *alabar* 'louer' de la phrase *Allah akbar* 'Dieu est grand' (!) et dire de cette suggestion impossible dans une sorte de résumé "The one suggested here . . . is of an unusual type, but seems to be a possible explanation of the word" trahit une faiblesse de jugement extraordinaire l'auteur ne s'est-il pas dit que, à ne pas parler des difficultés phonétiques, 'dire *allah akbar*' devrait au moins donner '*alabar-ar*'? Une des grandes tentations guettant l'étymologiste, c'est, quand une proposition nouvelle s'est présentée à son esprit, de rabaisser celles qui ont précédé la sienne que M. Brown, qui ne sait pas résister à cette tentation, pèse derechef les *pro* et les *contra* de son explication des verbes esp *tapar*, fr. *tapir* par l'arabe *tabaq*, et de la traditionnelle dans REW, s. v. (germ.) **tappu*, **tappjan*. "The final *qâf* drops off" l'autorité sur laquelle s'appuie notre auteur est Baist (1889)—mais comment à un auteur écrivant en 1938 le magistral volume de M. Steiger "Contribución á la fonética del hispano-árabe . . ." de 1932 (il n'est pas cité dans la bibliographie) pouvait-il échapper? Eh bien, à la p. 210, M. Steiger écarte précisément comme douteux les cas de chute de -q arabe final en espagnol sur lesquels s'appuie M. Brown après Baist *trafi*, *zabra*, et à la p. 217 il mentionne l'explication d'esp *fonda* (> *fúnduq*) par Baist lui-même (emprunt de l'arabe de Palestine à travers le français!) De plus, esp. *taba* n'est plus expliqué par arabe *tabaq* dans la 3^{ème} édition du REW (M. Brown se sert encore de la 2^{ème}!) Toute sa construction sur la famille *tap*-s'écroule donc

LEO SPITZER

Die Grundbegriffe der gesellschaftlichen Welt in den Werken des Abbé Prévost By WALTER MULLER Marburg, 1938 Pp. 100. This dissertation, submitted to the University of Marburg, has first

of all the merit of passing briefly in review recent Piévest bibliography, particularly a certain number of German studies published since M. Paul Hazard's classic *Études critiques sur Manon Lescaut*, of 1929. The author puts much emphasis upon the importance of money in conflict with love as a fundamental characteristic of the society portrayed by Prévost, and cites interesting passages in support of his thesis, which is of course not likely to be contested. It corresponds obviously to the situation of Des Grieux in relation to the pleasure-loving Manon. It corresponds also to the general tendencies of the time under the impetus of Law's "System," and fits in with what we know of Prévost's own early struggle for existence on the margins of society in France, Holland, and England. Dr. Muller finds also that Chance, Fatality, not unnaturally, plays a large part in Piévest's *Weltanschauung*. It is no doubt the fatality of a man who, all-too-often, had been unable to plan his course successfully in advance. The style of this monograph is unfortunately heavy, the content rather obvious, in sharp contrast to Prévost's own clear, simple, and distinguished prose.

The Ohio State University

GEORGE R. HAVENS

John Milton the Elder and his Music. By ERNEST BRENNECKE, JR. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. xvii + 224. \$3.50. (Columbia University Studies in Musicology, No. 2.) Professor Brennecke's book gives an excellent picture of 16th and 17th century musical life in England besides throwing new light on John Milton and his music. It is another bit of evidence proving that the Puritans were fond of music. From a strictly musical point of view, the compositions by the father of the poet have merit and deserve to be heard in concerts of old music today.

G. E. P. Arkwright and Sir Frederick Bridge—the one in 1900, the other in 1920—studied the music of John Milton, Sr. but this is the first extended monograph of the man and his times. It also adds materially to Sigmund Spaeth's book which dealt with the sources and significance of the younger Milton's knowledge of music. At the same time, Professor Brennecke has not discovered anything startlingly new and there is much we should still like to know if it could only be found. His second chapter, tracing Milton's forty part *In Nomine* to that curious Polish Prince, Albertus Alasco, described in Camden's *Annales*, London, 1625, is probable enough but by no means conclusive. Indeed, it is baffling that there is so little certainty regarding the musical scrivener's life for we are not even positive that he attended Christ Church. There are a few points which might have been expanded—for one thing the relationship of the Landgrave of Hesse and John Dowland. The 1643 and 1652 publications of York Tune by Richard Slatyer deserve a note,

the date of Tomkins' *Musica Deo Sacra* should be 1668 not 1688 and it is unfortunate that the reproduced title-page of Leighton's *Tears or Lamentations* should have been made from the copy in the British Museum which has lines ruled all over it, probably by an 18th-century schoolboy. The author gives the impression that the term "reports" was common in England. Actually this word seems to have been a Scotch expression as the elaborate contrapuntal settings of Daye, Damon, Cosyn and Farnaby were never so described. Finally, it is debatable whether the fanciful opening chapter *A Day at Christ Church* is necessary—particularly in a musicological series. The reader is considerably startled by Milton's being made to shy "a clod or two at a stray pig wallowing in the autumnal mud."

Aside from these few details, however, Professor Brennecke's book is a most welcome addition, both to Milton scholars and musicologists, the Columbia University Press is to be congratulated on the format.

CARLETON SPRAGUE SMITH

New York Public Library

Induction to Tragedy A Study in a Development of Form in "Gorboduc," "The Spanish Tragedy" and "Titus Andronicus." By HOWARD BAKER. University, Louisiana Louisiana State University Press, 1939. Pp x + 248 \$2 75 In this highly empirical discussion of aspects of early English tragedy Mr. Baker writes brightly and with an excited awareness of the things he has observed. Nevertheless, one tires of his book, for he habitually overplays and under-proves his points. He carries to unwise lengths the thesis of Professor Willard Farnham's wise book on *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy*, arguing, for example, that English blank verse takes its source in the riming stanzas of Gavin Douglas's Vergil-translation, that it became in Surrey's hands "as good a line as the very good lines of Marlowe and Kyd, and in no way different from theirs," and that the Senecan influence on pre-Shakespearean tragedy hardly exists. One word is a good deal abused, the word "foundational." This critic's alert eye seizes upon a short bit in a play, labels it "foundational," and builds thereupon a dogmatic theory of the play's origin and character. It is the method of putting in one's thumb and pulling out a plum, and that is no way to prove the consistency of the pudding, in so complex a time as the Elizabethan. Not that Mr. Baker does not find a good many plums. He does, and some of them are significant. One should read his book with thanks, and with wariness, for some one appears to have told Mr. Baker that learned literature is dull, and in this volume he is mainly concerned to flutter the Volscians in Corneli

TUCKER BROOKE

Yale University

The Sonnets of William Shakespeare & Henry Wriothesley, Third Earl of Southampton Together with "A Lover's Complaint" and "The Phoenix & Turtle" Edited with an Introduction by WALTER THOMSON. Oxford Basil Blackwell, 1938 Pp viii + 200 12/6 Mr Thomson adds another to the honorable and melancholy group of interpreters of Shakespeare's Sonnets. They are of the company of the Danaides, condemned forever to the task of making the liquid meaning of these poems rest in the leaky sieves of their hypotheses. *Non ragioniam di lor*,—or only briefly. The first part of the long Introduction is devoted to the probably not very needful purpose of defending Shakespeare against Oscar Wilde, Samuel Butler and other allegers of homosexuality. The second part explains how the editor, starting from the phrase "mutual render" in Sonnet 125, has arrived at the conclusion that Shakespeare wrote precisely one hundred sonnets of the first group, while his friend Southampton wrote the other twenty-six, plus the entire series on the Dark Women. *A Lover's Complaint* and *The Phoenix and the Turtle* are woven into the argument.

TUCKER BROOKE

Yale University

Francis Thompson. By FEDERIGO OLIVERO. Translation from the Italian text by DANTE MILANI. Torino S. Lattes, 1938. Pp. 290. This professedly comprehensive treatment of Thompson's thought and literary technique was intended, presumably, to create an enthusiasm for the poet among Italian readers. Its translation, not always idiomatic, can only be justified by a comparison with existing Thompson studies in English. As an introduction to the poet, it is inferior to Meynell's *Life of Francis Thompson* (new edit, 1916) and the English version of Megroz' *Francis Thompson* (1927). Professor Olivero supplemented these works by the extensive use of two German dissertations, but he omits so much important material available even in his English sources that his work is inadequate. The introductory "Life" omits such significant influences as the poet's early use of opium. Half of the chapter on "Metre" consists of general but undeveloped statements, such as, "A wonderful variety of modulations, rhythms and cadences stands out in the polymetre of *Sister Songs*" (p. 161), the rest of the chapter is an expansion of the treatment of repetition found in Beacock's Marburg dissertation, *Francis Thompson* (1912). Of Thompson's exercise in blank verse, to mention one omission, he has not a word. The footnotes are not methodical enough to give a true indication of his debt to his sources. For instance, the chapter on "Choice of Words" is based almost entirely on Beacock's analysis, but the first footnote appears after five pages of apparently original material.

The merits of the book spring chiefly from Professor Olivero's wide reading and his sensitive if somewhat uncritical appreciation of Thompson's poetry. The most valuable part of the book is the rather impressive list of possible sources and analogues in the ninth chapter.

KERBY NEILL

The Catholic University of America

Hartmann von Aue Studien zu einer Biographie. Von H. SPARNAAY, Zweiter Band. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1938. 150 Seiten. Rm 7.—Fünf Jahre nach Erscheinen des im allgemeinen beifällig aufgenommenen ersten Bandes findet endlich Sparnaay's zweiter Band den Weg in die Öffentlichkeit. Mit derselben Gediegenheit, die für den ersten Teil charakteristisch ist, führt hier Sparnaay die Blosslegung und Ergründung der Probleme um Hartmann weiter. Ihm ist es gegeben, alles bisher Erarbeitete und Geschaute einheitlich abzurunden und in kritischer Form uns vorzuführen. Entstehungsgeschichte, Quellengeschichte, keltische Varianten, ethische Probleme, Stil usw. werden hier beim *Armen Heinrich* wie bei *Iwein* erschöpfend behandelt und die zugehörigen Theorien vorsichtig gegeneinander abgewogen. Verbindende Linien werden zu *Erek* und *Gregor* gezogen und dabei Gehalt, Gestaltung, Stil, Sprache und Personifikationen tiefeschürfend dargelegt. Auch die Person des Dichters ist vorsichtig herausgeschält und seinem Bildungsgang, seiner Religion, seinem Gottesbegriff je ein volles Kapitel gewidmet. Eine unbedeutende Schwäche tritt bei der Quellenbehandlung zutage. Wenn auch bei der synthetischen Behandlung *Iweins* das Verhältniss zu Chrestien befriedigend beleuchtet ist, wird doch der Infiltration fremder Sagenstoffe gerade über Chrestien zu wenig Beachtung geschenkt. In Colregants Erzählung z. B. hatte man bei der Erwähnung der Vogel gerne die Heranziehung der *Navigatio S. Brandani* als Quelle erwähnt gesehen, die über die anglonormannische Bearbeitung eines Benedikt durch Chrestien klar erkennbar ist. Einen ganz bedeutenden Wertzuwachs erfährt das Buch durch die Beigabe einer Bibliographie, die sich auf fast 40 Seiten erstreckt und in leicht übersichtlicher Gruppierung an die 600 Nummern aufzuweisen hat. Trotzdem ist diese Bibliographie nicht erschöpfend. Bei der sonst auffallenden Gründlichkeit des Verfassers wirkt es fast etwas befremdend, dass Beiträge amerikanischer Germanisten auffallend spärlich genannt sind. Ein Blick in die betreffenden Zeitschriften hätte dem Verfasser eine nicht unbedeutende Ausbeute ergeben. Trotz dieses offenbaren Versehens macht die Bibliographie allem schon das Buch für jeden Germanisten unentbehrlich.

CARL SELMER

Hunter College

The Development of American Social Comedy from 1787 to 1936. By JOHN GEOFFREY HARTMAN Philadelphia, 1939 Pp. 151 Despite Mr Hartman's modest claims, this study does more than "provide material for the future social historian" It surveys the entire field of American social comedy, from Tyler's *Contrast* (1787) to Behrman's *End of Summer* (1936), and attempts to show its development as a reflection of changing social conditions Mr Hartman is not quite successful in defining social comedy, he seems to be perplexed by social satire and social drama. That the American comedy of manners is still an evolving mode is clear, but that its present temper, so full of uncomic implications, is necessarily inferior to that of Clyde Fitch is questionable Nor does it follow that "since the male population of America is largely absorbed in business, the result has naturally been a more limited field for social comedy" One of the values of this study is its revelation that the field of American social comedy, for its comparatively short history, has been far from limited

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

The Johns Hopkins University

England's Musical Poet, Thomas Campion By MILES MERWIN KASTENDIECK New York Oxford University Press, 1938 Pp. 11 + 218 \$3.50 Mr. Kastendieck has chosen a subject which well deserves detailed and illuminating treatment by a scholar versed in both poetry and music. He makes, to be sure, some claims for his book which are not entirely justified Other scholars and teachers (notably J. L. Lowes) have for at least two decades, in more than one college class-room if not in print, emphasized the necessity of studying Elizabethan songs together with their music, and Mr. Kastendieck exaggerates the ignorance and bewilderment of previous critics on the subject Also the present reviewer emphatically does not agree that in the book "the story of the marriage of words and music in Campion's ayres has now been told as thoroughly as any creative process may be divulged" (p. 160). The book suffers, too, from marked deficiencies in style: unnecessary repetitions, frequent awkward and obscure sentences, and a plan which is far from lucidly worked out The author establishes, however, several markedly interesting and sound points, such as the facts that Campion's musical sense is closely related to his feeling for quantity in verse, that there is a general relationship between quantity in verse and the time-scheme of Elizabethan music, and that Campion's melodies differ from such melodies as Schubert's in being so intimately related to their words that they are not successful apart from them. Mr. Kastendieck's study is of service to students of literature and music, though it might have been of greater service than it is.

GEORGE REUBEN POTTER

University of California

CORRESPONDENCE

IT *bravo*—ALL *Polier*—FR *camée*—ALL *Schamotte* Dans la revue "Wörter und Sachen" fondée par Meisinger et Meyer-Lübke et transformée par le directeur actuel, H. Guntert, aussi bien au point de vue de la présentation extérieure des fascicules qu'à celui du contenu—elle porte maintenant le sous-titre "Zeitschrift für indogerm. Sprachwissenschaft, Volksforschung und Kulturgeschichte," c'est-à-dire elle a été "mise au pas"—on trouve toujours comme auparavant des articles de romanisants je distingue deux catégories il y a les articles de Weltanschauung (p. ex. si E. Winkler statue que les linguistes français ne voient dans la langue qu'un moyen de communication, alors que les Allemands sentent un "sprachlich gestalteter Kosmos") et il y a des articles plus techniques. Les premiers sont indiscutables, parce que le parti-pris nationaliste ou racial leur est écrit au front. Parmi les seconds je signalerai les articles de M. Krause—pour les réfuter le mot *bravo*—remonterait (d'après M. Krause, I, 303) au grec *βραβεῖον*, lat. *brabium* 'prime de victoire,' plus précisément à un **brabius* qui désignerait l'athlète combattant pour le *ἄθλον* de là le *bravo*, assassin soudoyé, de la renaissance, qui se comparerait à l'all. *Fechtbruder*, *Fechter* 'bandit.' Pour *bi* > *v* on rappelle l'ital. *capitium* > *caverza*, le fr. *rêve de rabies* d'après Diez. A lire ces parallèles, on douterait que l'Allemagne ait une fois élevé la phonétique au rang d'une science un *brabium* (l'auteur a soin de mettre le signe de la brièveté sur le *ä*, mais de ne pas indiquer la longueur de la voyelle *i* latine, issue de la diphthongue grecque) est parallélisé avec *-pi-* et avec *b_i* (l'étymologie de Diez n'est, bien entendu, sérieusement soutenue par personne aujourd'hui). Et le côté sémantique? on sait pourtant que l'it. *bravo* est emprunté à l'esp. *bravo* significatif 'féroce' et que toute explication doit prendre son point de départ de la langue et de l'acception originaire. Expliquer l'espagnolisme italien *bravo* par du latin (*brabium*), c'est comme expliquer le germanisme français *nazi* par du latin (p. ex. *nasus*)! L'all. *Fechtbruder* etc. vient d'ailleurs de *fechten*, terme des artisans, "indem sie fechten von ihren Fechtspielen auf ihren Wanderbettel übertragen" (Kluge-Goetze), a donc son origine dans des milieux tout à fait différents de ceux de *bravo*.

Le mot allemand *Polier* 'contre-maître de maçons,' 'appareilleur,' qu'on avait expliqué auparavant par un *parleur* français, inexistant dans ce sens, serait d'après M. Krause en même temps deux étymons qui auraient convergé lat. *bajulus* (*balus*), propose par M. A. Klein, *Deutsche Bauzeitung*, 1916, en vue de la variante *Ballier*, + le latin *politor* 'cultivateur d'un champ qui jouit d'une partie du rendement.' Je ne vois pas comment un mot *lalm*, nullement conservé en roman, aurait pu se superposer à *bajulus* contamination suppose existence des deux termes qui se croisent. Le fait que Goethe emploie la forme *Polierer*, n'est pas plus significatif que l'all. *Tapezierer*, qui a ajouté le suffixe allemand *-er* au mot d'emprunt *Tapezier* = fr. *tapissier* (cette forme existe encore à Berlin *tapstr*),

et ne prouve rien pour l'existence d'un *politor*. Si *Polier* venait de *polieren* 'polir,' la forme *Policier* devrait être beaucoup plus répandue. Je crois, sous bénéfice d'inventaire, que la famille romane de *bajulus* suffit pour expliquer *Polier*. M. Kiause a des idées nébuleuses sur le changement de *bajulus*, *balius* > en lat. médiéval *ballivus*, et *balivo* de même que plus haut pour *brabium*, il ne se prononce pas sur l'accent de *balius* et ne dit pas clairement qu'une dérivation en *-ivus* donne l'it. *balivo*, et ajoutons-le, le fi. *bailli* (*sous-bailli*, *sous-bailleur*) qui signifie tout simplement 'administrateur' et pour lequel Godefroy donne un *baillier* (attesté une fois) avec le changement de suffixe *-i* > *-ier*. Voir les différents sens de *bajulus* et *bajul-ivus* FEW I, 207 'régisseur, maigüillier, huissier, maître-valet, maître-berger, employé comptable, intendant' etc. Ce n'est pas de l'italien, qui a emprunté la famille de mots au français (REW s. v. *bajulus*, *bajulare*), mais seulement de cette dernière langue que le mot allemand peut venir. Sur le *bajulus* du moyen-âge v. Susanne Eisenberg, "Geschichte des frz. Verbums *bailler* (< *bajulare*)" (thèse de Munich, 1933), p. 64, qui cite aussi d'après Du Cange les *bajuli artificum* (*argentariorum*, *menescallorum*, *textatorum*, *macellatorum*), et l'angl. *bailliff* 'juge dans une corporation' qu'elle compare au "Gewerkschaftsführer" moderne, correspondant aux *bajuli confratriae*.

L'article de M. Kiause sur le nom du coquillage 'came' contient, sous une forme embrouillée, quelques bonnes suggestions. Comme le nom de la porcelaine vient de celui d'un coquillage (*Concha Veneris*) dont on utilisait la nacre et comme on disait *porcelaine* au XVI^{ème} siècle de la poterie venant d'Orient, le *camée* (ital. *cameo*) pourrait avoir son nom de *χάμη*, lat. *chāma* 'came,' coquillage dont on aurait sculpté la valve. C'est une bonne idée, seulement comment faire le pont entre le fr. *chame* (tel est le représentant authentique de *χάμη*, *chāma*), attesté depuis le XVI^{ème} siècle (la forme *game*, que donne M. K., m'est inconnue, à moins qu'il ne confonde la forme *game* attestée dans God. s. v. *gemme*, *jame* et qui est soit une graphie pour *jamme* soit un latinisme, v. la forme *gueme*) et l'a. fr. du XIII^{ème} siècle *camacheus*, qu'il faut interpréter *camareu* et auquel reconduit aussi l'esp. *camafeo*? Evidemment le radical de *chāma* convient bien, mais il faudrait rendre compte de la terminaison (-aios??).

Le mot all. *Schamotte* pour l' 'argile réfractaire' est expliqué par ce même *chama* (l'argile étant rendue plus résistante par le mélange de fragments de porcelaine et de coquillages). M. K. ne mentionne pas la forme *chame* fr. et dit expressément que le fr. ne connaît pas le mot *chamotte*. Mais il est pourtant évident que **chamotte* doit être une formation française en -otte, tirée de *chame* et qu'on trouvera bien un jour dans les patois

LEO SPITZER

INDEX

SUBJECTS

American Drama

The Beginnings of the Professional Theatre in Texas 202, The Development of American Social Comedy from 1787 to 1936 632

American Fiction, Scandinavian Themes in 202

American Poetry

Chinese Themes in American Verse 202, New Poetry of New England, Frost and Robinson 614

Anglo-Saxon, The Jefferson — Grammar and Reader 157

a or batu A Problem in Lexicology 413

Arnould, Antoine, see Jurieu, Pierre
 Arnim, Achim von, Literary Criticism and Romantic Theory in the Work of 623

Arthurian Romance The King's Household in the Arthurian Court from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Malory 145

Audelay, John The Date and Authorship of *The Fraternite of Vacabondes* 347

Austrian Literature, see German Literature

Awdeley, John, see Audelay

Barrett, The Family of the 609

Bartholomaeus Anglicus, see Shakespeare

Baudelaire *Les Limbes* 195

Beaumont and Fletcher (A Concise Bibliography) 605

Bédier, Joseph — 1864-1938 554

Behn, Aphra, Montfleury's *Ecole des jaloux* and —'s *The False Count* 438

belluré 506

Beowulf The Monsters and the Critics 217

Béranger's Neglected Poem to Manuel 32

Bible, Emerson's Use of the 202

Blake, William —'s Circle of Destiny 68

Boccaccio

—'s Story of Tito e Gisippo in European Literature 553, Linee di una storia della critica al

Decameron con bibliografia boccaccesca completamente aggiornata 615

Brant, An Obscure Line in —'s *Narrenschuff* 283

bravo 633

Brawne, Fanny, Letters of — to Fanny Keats 1820-1824 153

British History, A Bibliography of — (1700-1715) 76

Brooks, Charles Timothy —, Translator from the German and the Genteel Tradition 42

Brown, Charles

Life of John Keats Edited with an Introduction and Notes by D H Bodurtha and W B Pope 153, Some Letters and Miscellanea of —, the Friend of John Keats and Thomas Richards 153

Browning, *Hommes et Femmes*, poèmes choisis 394

Burke, Edmund — and Horace Walpole 124

Byron's Translation and Use of Modern Greek Writings 317

Camée 633

Campion, Thomas, England's Musical Poet, — 632

Carlyle

— et la pensée latine 154; —'s Fusion of Poetry, History, and Religion by 1834 73

Castillo Solórzano's *El celoso hasta la muerte* and Montfleury's *Ecole des jaloux* 436

Cazotte, Jacques

New Facts Relating to the Biography of 19, La Première rédaction de *l'Olivier* de 28

Cervantes The Imitations of *Don Quixote* in the Spanish Drama 228

Chapman, George

— (A Concise Bibliography) 605, —'s Fortune with Winged Hands Supplementary 201.

Chastellux, Un Philosophe cosmopolite du 18^e siècle, le chevalier de — 550.

Chatterton, The Walpole — Controversy 460

Chaucer

- 's Romance Vocabulary 140, A
—ian (?) Fisherman 448, A Fur-
ther Note on Dougen's *Exempla*
137, "A Governour Wily and
Wys" 477, Medieval English Do-
mestic Life and Amusements in
the Works of 140, The Place of
Group F in the *Canterbury* Chro-
nology 140, Quotations from St
Bernard in *The Parson's Tale* 447,
Wife of Bath's Tale 1159-62 133

chief 290

Chinese Themes in American Verse
202Clontarf, Irish and Norse Traditions
about the Battle of 215

Cloune, William de 477

Coleidge, Sara — and Henry Reed
475Collier, The Jeremy — Stage Con-
troversy, 1698-1726 386

Collins, William

A Doubtful Poem in the — Canon
361, Poor —, his Life, his Art,
and his Influence 64

Congreve, The Authorship of "A
Poem to the Memory of Mr —"
599

cooning 449

Courtesy Books Bibliography of
Courtesy and Conduct Books in
17th Century England 476

Cowley, Abraham, Three Unpub-
lished Letters of 454

Cowper, William —, Humanitarian
391

Coyfurelly, The Identity of 'M T
—' 510

Dallas, E S A Note on *Kettner's*
Book of the Table 363

Dante, Numerical Symbolism in —
and the *Pearl* 256

dauby 449

D'avenant, Sir William — Poet
Laureate and Playwright-Manager
606

Defoe's Use of Personal Experience
in *Colonel Jack* 362

Dekker

Note on —'s *Old Fortunatus* 351,
— and Webster Note on the Text
of *The Famous History of Sir*
Thomas Wyatt 585

Dennys, John. A Chaucerian (?)
Fisherman 448

Diderot, L'Humanisme de 301

Donne, An Interpretation of —'s
Tenth Elegy 280

Dostoevsky's English Reputation
(1881 1936) 624

Drury Lane Calendar, 1747-1776 232

Dryden's Use of Scudery's *Almahide*
190

Edinburgh Miscellany (The), see
Malloch, David

Emerson's Use of the Bible 202

Encyclopédie, Voltaire et l'— 617

Engadine, see Romansh Poetry

English Some Linguistic Studies of
1937 and 1938 525

English Association, Essays and
Studies by Members of the — —
626

English Cycle Plays The Age of
Isaac at the time of the Sacrifice
579

English Drama

Cavalier Drama, an Historical and
Critical Supplement to the Study
of the Elizabethan and Restoration
Stage 209, Drury Lane Calendar,
1747-1776 232, Excursions in 314,
Induction to Tragedy A Study
in a Development of Form in
Gorboduc, *The Spanish Tragedy*
and *Titus Andronicus* 629, Pro-
verbs in the Earlier — — With
Illustrations from Contemporary
French Plays 295, The Voyagers
and Elizabethan Drama 603

English History Essays Historical
and Literary 156, see also British
History

English Humanism Lateinische
Dichtung in England vom Ausgang
des Frühhumanismus bis zum
Regierungsantritt Elisabeths Un-
tersuchung zur nationalen und
religiösen Grundlegung des en-
glishen Humanismus 610

English Literature

The Crescent and the Rose Islam
and England during the Renais-
sance 62, Essays and Studies 626,
Essays Historical and Literary
156, Geschichte der englischen
Literatur von den Anfängen bis
zur Gegenwart 626, Wit and Rhe-
toric in the Renaissance 147

English Novel, The History of the
474

English Poetry The Elizabethan
Sonnet Sequences Studies in Con-
ventional Conceits 315

Æteter Book Riddle 41 as a Contin-
uation of *Riddle* 40 259

- Faiguet, réformateur de l'orthographe 523
Faits des Romains, Fragments from the 366
Faustsplutter, An Italo-German — of 1621 286
 Feltham, Owen, New Facts Regarding 199
fenagling, see *phenagling*
 Fenton, Elijah — 1683-1730 75.
 Fletcher, see Beaumont.
 Fontane, see Heyse
 Fontenelle, Deux lettres inédites de — à Newton 188
 Franklin and William Penn's *No Cross, No Crown* 466.
Fraternité of Vacabondes (The), see Audelay, John
 French
 Elements de phonologie française 218, Evolution et structure de la langue française 218, Das substantivierte Adjektiv im Französischen 148, 238
 French Drama, The King's Minister in 17th Century — 94
 French Literature
 Anti-Slavery Opinion in France during the Second Half of the 18th Century 55, The Clandestine Organization and Diffusion of Philosophic Ideas in France from 1700 to 1750 385, L'Exotisme dans la littérature française depuis Chateaubriand Le romantisme 378
 French Novel
 Four French Novelists, Marcel Proust, André Gide, Jean Giraudoux, Paul Morand 389, The Novel of Adolescence in France, the Study of a Literary Theme 389
 French Poetry Poèmes de transition (15^e-16^e siècle) 555
 French Realism The Critical Reaction, 1830-1870 389
 Frost, see American Poetry
 Gala (La) del nadar—Date and Authorship 514
 Garrick, David —, Dramatist 210
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, see Arthurian Romance
 German
 Deutscher Sprachatlas 72, Geschichte der deutschen Sprache 48
 German Folklore Das Schemenlaufen in Tirol und verwandte alpenländische Masken- und Faschachtsbräuche 234
 German Folk-Songs Lesebuch des deutschen Volksliedes 394
 German Literature
 Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte 45, Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock Die deutsche Literatur im Zeitraum des 17. Jahrhunderts 367, Deutsche Literaturkunde Erbgut und Erfüllung 45, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur 45, Social Ideals in — 1770-1830 49
 German Novel Bibliographie zur Theorie und Technik des deutschen Romans (1910-1938) 557.
 German Poetry Von deutscher Dichtung Ein Jugend- und Volksbuch 45
 Germanic, Nominal Compounds in 618
 Gide, André 389.
 Giraudoux, Jean 389
 Godwin, William Notes on 41 Skinner Street 326
 Goethe
 — *Kalender auf das Jahr 1938* 234, Grillparzer, Lessing, and — in the Perspective of European Literature 543, Some Remarks Regarding a Textual Change in —'s *Heidenroslein* 35
Gorboduc, see Norton and Sackville
 Gosson, Melbancke and 111, 398
 Gracián, *El Criticón* 374
 Gray, Thomas
 —, Scholar, the True Tragedy of an 18th Century Gentleman 64; Chronologie de la vie et de l'œuvre de 64; Essai sur 64
 Greene, Pettie and 105
 Grillparzer
 —, Lessing, and Goethe in the Perspective of European Literature 543, —'s *dramatisches Werk* 307, —'s Political Ideas and *Die Juden von Toledo* 622
 Hardy, Thomas
 —'s Debt to Webster in *The Return of the Native* 497, The Chronology of *The Return of the Native* 491
 Harland, Henry —, an American Forerunner of Proust 420
 Hartmann von Aue Studien zu einer Biographie 631
 Hauptmann
 — und Shakespeare Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Fortlebens

- Shakespeares in Deutschland 545,
Die soziale, politische und wirtschaftliche Zeitkritik im Werke
Geihrart —s 545
- Heine
Housman's *Last Poems*, XXX and
—'s *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, 62 288,
Marginalien zu — II 399
Heland, A Note on Line 1514 of the
— 284
Helicon 158
Henryson, Robert — and the Ful-
gentian Horse 239
Heyse, Schott, and Fontane 287
Heywood, Thomas 279
Hildebrandslied 20 22a 501
Hoskyns, John, The Life, Letters,
and Writings of —, 1566-1638 147
Housman's *Last Poems*, XXX and
Heine's *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, 62
288
Howard, Henry, see Surrey.
Humanism and Naturalism A Com-
parative Study of Ernest Seillière,
Irving Babbitt and Paul Elmer
More 372, see also English Hu-
manism
Hunt, Leigh, My — Library The
Holograph Letters 393
Hystore Job 221
- Ibsen: The Courtiers in *Hamlet* and
The Wild Duck 196
Icelandic Die Laute des modernen
Islandischen 150.
Idley, Peter —'s *Instructions to his
Son* 310
Inkle and Yarico 470.
Irish and Norse Traditions about
the Battle of Clontarf 215
Isaac, The Age of — at the Time of
the Sacrifice 579.
Italian Dizionario di marina medie-
vale e moderno 157
Italian Drama L'origine del dram-
ma liturgico 299
Italian Translations, Corrections to
the Shields Bibliography of 397
- Jean Renart, Notes sur 262
Jefferson, The — Anglo-Saxon Gram-
mar and Reader 157.
Jordan, William, Uhtred de Boldon,
Friar —, and *Piers Plowman* 472
Jurieu, Pierre — und seine Aus-
einandersetzung mit Antoine
Arnauld im Streit um die Rechts-
fertigungs- und Gnadenlehre 229
- Keats, Fanny, see Brawne, Fanny
Keats, John, Life of 153
Kettner's Book of the Table, see
Dallas, E S
Kleist, Heinrich von
— und J J Rousseau 306, —s
Weike 304, *Der zerbrochene Krug*
und *König Oedipus* 267
Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy* 629
- La Calprenède, A Portuguese Adap-
tation of —'s *Faramond* 192
Latin Verse of Renaissance England,
see English Humanism
layette 582
Lessing, Guillaupzer, —, and Goethe
in the Perspective of European
Literature 543
Lichtenberg's Visits to England as
described in his *Letters* and
Diaries 308
Lydgate See *Myche*, *Say Lytell*,
and *Lerne to Soffer in Tyme* 131
- Machiavelli's *Prince* and its Fore-
runners The *Prince* as a Typical
Book *De Regimine Principum* 469
Maistre, Joseph de — et l'Angleterre
230
Mallarmé
—, ein Dichter des Jahrhundert-
Endes 225, la Métaphore dans
l'œuvre de 225
Mallet The Authorship of "A
Poem to the Memory of Mr Con-
greve" 599
Malloch, David — and the *Edin-
burgh Miscellany* 468
Malory, see Arthurian Romance
Manuel, Jacques-Antoine, see Bér-
anger.
Masks, see German Folklore
Massinger, Philip — (A Concise
Bibliography) 605
Medici, Cosimo de' —, Pater Patriae,
1389-1464 475
Melbancke and Gosson 111, 398
Melville, Herman —s *Gedankengut*:
Eine kritische Untersuchung seiner
weltanschaulichen Grundideen 202
Mexican-Spanish, see Spanish
Middleton, *Hengist, King of Kent*
607
Milton
— as Proof Reader 353, The
Meaning of "Gods" in *Paradise
Lost* 450; *Paradise Lost Para-
dise Regained*, the Minor Poems,
and *Samson Agonistes* 75

- Milton, John — the Elder and his Music 628
Mirror for Magistrates 207
 Molière in Franche-Comte 517
 Montdory, Le Comédien auvergnat —, introducteur et interprète de Corneille 74
 Montfleury
 —'s *Ecole des jaloux* and Aphra Behn's *The False Count* 438,
 Castillo Solórzano's *El celoso hasta la muerte* and —'s *Ecole des jaloux* 436
 Morand, Paul 389
 More, Thomas 142
 Moreto, see *Gala (La) del nadar*
 Morgenstern, Zu —s Steinochs 198
 Motte, Swift, — and the Copyright Struggle Two Unnoticed Documents 114
 Naturalism, see Humanism
 NED, A Note for the 449
 Nestroy, Johann — *Ausgewählte Werke* 77
 Newton, see Fontenelle
 Norse, Irish and — Traditions about the Battle of Clontarf 215
 Norton and Sackville, *Gorboduc* 629
 Notker, The Comparative and Superlative Suffixes -er- -est- and -ör- -öst- in —'s Works 1
 Old French
 The — Lives of Saint Agnes and other Vernacular Versions of the Middle Ages 221, *Altfranzösische Grammatik* 218, Crime and Punishment in the — Romances 551, Les Gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi, T II, *Etudes lexicographiques* 51, Répertoire des lexiques du vieux français 53, Two — Poems on Saint Thibaut 221
 Old Icelandic, The Doublets — *Skyttu Skyttja*, 'Shooter, Marksman' 445
 Ovid, A Concordance of 556
 Painter, William 279
 Pearl, Numerical Symbolism in Dante and the — 256
 Penn, William, Franklin and —'s *No Cross, No Crown* 466
 Percival, Thomas, see Poe.
 Pettie
 — and Greene 105, *A Petite Pallace of — His Pleasure* 316
phenagling 291
 Philips, Ambrose, Notes on 354
 Phonetics *Grundfragen der Phonetrie* 50
Piers Plowman, Uhtred de Boldon, Friar William Joidan, and — 472
 Poe's Dr Percival A Note on *The Fall of the House of Usher* 129
 Polcenigo, Count di, see Voltaire
 Polier 633
 Pope
 The Beginning of —'s Friendship with Spence 359, On the Poetry of 69, The Poetical Career of 541
 Portuguese, From Latin to —, Historical Phonology and Morphology of the — Language 376
 Prévost
 Die Grundbegriffe der gesellschaftlichen Welt in den Werken des Abbé — 627, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la vertu 592
 Proust
 — 389, Henry Harland, an American Forerunner of 420
Proverbes en rimes Text and Illustrations of the 15th Century from a French MS in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore 56
 Puritanism, Tudor — A Chapter in the History of Idealism 600
 Racine, Jean Saint-Réal's *Don Carlos* and *Phèdre*, 1093-6 519
 Racine, Jean Baptiste, Unpublished Letters of — to the Abbé Renaudot 172
 Raschi, Les Gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de —, T II, *Etudes lexicographiques* 51
 Rattermann, Heinrich Armin —, German American Author, Poet, and Historian, 1832-1923 76.
 Reade, Charles The Making of *The Oloster and the Hearth* 312
Recluse (The), "The Hours of the Planets" — an Obscure Passage in 442
 Reed, Henry, Sara Coleridge and — 475
 Renart, see Jean Renart
 Renaudot, abbé, see Racine, Jean-Baptiste
 Rhetoric, The Philosophy of 213
 Richards, Thomas, see Brown, Charles
 Rimbaud, Arthur — in Abyssinia 74

- Robinson, Edwin Arlington, see American Poetry
- Rochester, Two Poems Ascribed to 458
- Romans, Jules, Denkform und Gemeinschaft bei 223
- Romance Philology
Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker 547, Language cultura (studii linguistici) 548, Some Romance Words of Arabic or Germanic Origin 627
- Romansh Poetry, Studies in Modern — in the Engadine 552
- Rousseau, J. J., Heinrich von Kleist und — 306
- Ruin, *The* 37
- Sackville, A Chaucerian (?) Fisherman 448, see also Norton and Sackville
- Saint Agnes, The O F Lives of — and Other Vernacular Versions of the Middle Ages 221
- Saint-Real's *Don Carlos* and *Phèdre*, 1093-6 519
- Saint Thibaut, Two O F Poems on 221
- Salinas, P., *Lost Angel and Other Poems* Translations by E. L. Turnbull 303
- Scandinavian Themes in American Fiction 202
- Schamotte 633
- Schott, see Heyse
- Scott, Sir Walter
—, Bart 612, An Unpublished Ballad Translation by —, *The Battle of Killiecrankie* 13, 235
- Scudéry, Dryden's Use of —'s *Almanide* 190
- Seafarer (*The*), An Interpretation 232
- Sealsfield, Charles, The Spirit of America as Interpreted in the Works of 202
- See Myche, Say Lytell, and Lerne to Soffer in *Tyme* 131
- Shakespeare
— 313, — and the Post Horses 395, — Forbears 332, — Studies *Hamlet* 233, —'s Influence on the Drama of his Age Studied in *Hamlet* 314, —'s Young Lovers 396, The Courtiers in *Hamlet* and *The Wild Duck* 196, Hauptmann und 545; Jaques, and the Antiquaries 79, Jaques' "Seven Ages" and Bartholomaeus Anglicus 273, A New Variorum Edition of — The Poems 138, The Repute or —'s Sonnets in the Early 19th Century 462, *Roméo and Juliet* further Restored 85, The Sonnets of — and Henry Wriothesley, Third Earl of Southampton Together with 1 *Love's Complaint* and *The Phocur and Turtle* 630, A Textual Dilemma in 1 *Henry IV* 276, *Titus Andronicus* 629, *The Tragedy of Hamlet* a Critical Edition of the Second Quarto, 1604 205, What Happens in *Hamlet* 235, What Purgative Drug? 92
- Shelley, Mary —, A Biography 66
- Shelley, P. B., The Unextinguished Hearth, — and his Contemporary Critics 71
- Skinner Street, see Godwin, William
- skyt skytja* 445
- Sloane, MS — 3548, Folio 158 246
- Smollett, Editor of Voltaire 429
- Soane, George, Some Plays by 278
- Solórzano, see Castillo Solórzano
- Sonne (Die) geht zu Gnaden* 8, 236
- Sophocles, see Kleist
- Southampton, see Wriothesley
- Spanish Final Consonant Plus N-Glide in Jalisco, Mexico 439
- Spanish Drama, The Imitations of *Don Quixote* in the — 228
- Spence, The Beginning of Pope's Friendship with 359
- Spenser, Edmund, The Works of — A Variorum Edition *The Faerie Queene*, Books Six and Seven 293
- Stachel (Der) der Liebe* An Early 15th Century German MS 572
- Steele Inkle and Yarico 470
- Stimulus Amoris* 572
- Surrey, Henry Howard, Earl of 611
- Swift
—, Motte and the Copyright Struggle Two Unnoticed Documents 114, —'s Marriage to Stella 59, The Poems of 59
- Tahureau, Sources of —'s Lyrics 339
- Texas, see American Drama
- Thompson, Francis 630
- Thomson, James, see Mallet
- Thule, Vinland and Ultima — 159
- Tieck, Ludwig, Letters of — Hitherto Unpublished 1792-1853 39.
- Travel Literature
Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel, vol. 2, The New World 625, Travel and Literature 625

- Uhtred de Boldon, Friar William Jordan, and *Piers Plowman* 472
 Ultima Thule, see Thule
- Veiras, Denis — et son *Histoire des Sevarambes* (1677-1679) 380
- Vinland and Ultima Thule 159
- Voltaire
 — et l'*Encyclopédie* 617, A Bibliographical Note on 520, A MS Copy of Writings by 365, Note on the Etymology of Names in —'s *Zadig* 597, Smollett, Editor of 429, The Spirit of 383, *Le Temple du goût* 301, Unedited — Letters to Count di Polcenigo 184
- Walpole, Horace
 — and Edmund Burke 124, The — Chatterton Controversy 460;
- Anecdotes of Painting in England, 1760-1795* 231
- Walton, Izaak —, *Prochean Amy* 589
- Webster, John
 The Complete Works of 77, Dekker and — Note on the Text of *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt* 585, Hardy's Debt to — in *The Return of the Native* 497
- Whitman, Walt — as a Critic of Literature 202
- Winter, Hans —s *Bericht von der Kunst des Meistergesangs* 567
- Wordsworth, Some Sources of —'s Passages on Mythology 127
- Wriothesley, Henry, see Shakespeare
- zèbre 78

AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

- Ainsworth, E. G., Poor Collins 64
- Aish, D. A., La Métaphore dans l'œuvre de Stéphane Mallarmé 225
- Allen, D. C., Melbancke and Gosson 111, 398
- Allen, N. B., *Romeo and Juliet* further Restored 85
- Anderson, M. L., Hardy's Debt to Webster in *The Return of the Native* 497
- Anderson, O. S., *The Seafarer*, An Interpretation 232
- Anthony, R., The Jeremy Collier Stage Controversy, 1698-1726 386
- Babbitt, Irving, see Humanism
- Bach, A., Geschichte der deutschen Sprache 48
- Baker, E. A., The History of the English Novel 474
- Baker, H., Induction to Tragedy 629
- Baker, I., The King's Household in the Arthurian Court from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Malory 145
- Bald, R. C. (ed.), Middleton *Hengist, King of Kent* 607
- Banks, T. H., The Meaning of "Gods" in *Paradise Lost* 450
- Barnstorff, H., Die soziale, politische und wirtschaftliche Zeitkritik im Werke Gerhart Hauptmanns 545
- Barry, M. I., see Deferrari, R. J.
- Bates, R. C. (ed.), *L'Hystore Job* 221
- Baudin, M., The King's Minister in 17th Century French Drama 94.
- Bédier, Joseph, see Subjects
- Bertoni, G., Lingua e cultura (studi linguistici) 548, —, Falgui, E. and Prati, A., Dizionario di marina medievale e moderno 157
- Blondheim, D. S., Les Gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi 51
- Bodurtha, D. H. and Pope, W. B. (eds.), C. A. Brown, *Life of John Keats* 153
- Bonno, G., Deux lettres inédites de Fontenelle à Newton 188
- Bowers, F. T., An Interpretation of Donne's Tenth Elegy 280
- Bowman, W. P., Some Plays by George Soane 278
- Boys, R., David Malloch and *The Edinburgh Miscellany* 468
- Braaksma, M. H., Travel and Literature 625
- Branca, V., Linee di una storia della critica al *Decameron* 615
- Brennecke, E., Jr., John Milton the Elder and his Music 628
- Bressie, R., "A Governour Wily and Wys" 477, MS Sloane 3548, Folio 158 246
- Brewer, L. A., My Leigh Hunt Library 393
- Broughton, L. N. (ed.), Sara Coleridge and Henry Reed 475
- Brown, C., See Myche, Say Lytell, and Lerne to Soffer in Tyme 131
- Brown, F. K., Notes on 41 Skinner Street 326

- Brown, L P, Some Romance Words of Arabic or Germanic Origin 627
- Bush, D, William Painter and Thomas Heywood 279
- Cameron, M D, Sources of Tahaureau's *Lyrics* 339
- Campbell, L B (ed), *The Mirror for Magistrates* 207
- Carcassonne, E (ed), Voltaire, *Le Temple du goût* 301
- Carr, C T, Nominal Compounds in Germanic 618
- Casady, E, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey 611
- Castle, E (ed), Deutsch-osterreichische Literaturgeschichte 45
- Cawley, R R, The Voyagers and Elizabethan Drama 603
- Cazamian, L (tr), R Browning, *Hommes et Femmes* 394
- Chambers, R W, Thomas More 142
- Chapman, C O, Numerical Symbolism in Dante and the *Pearl* 256
- Chester, A G, The Date and Authorship of *The Fraternite of Vacabondes* 347
- Chew, S C, The Crescent and the Rose 62
- Chew, S. P, Jr, Prévost's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la vertu* 592
- Choranescu, Al, La Première rédaction de *l'Olivier de Cazotte* 28
- Coffin, R P T, New Poetry of New England, Frost and Robinson 614
- Coles, B, Shakespeare Studies *Hamlet* 233
- Colledge, E, "The Hours of the Planets" 442
- Coon, A M, Izaak Walton, *Procheim Amy* 589
- Cornu, D, Swift, Motte and the Copyright Struggle Two Unnoticed Documents 114
- Corson, J C, Scott's *Battle of Killiecrankie* 235
- Cottier, E, Le Comédien auvergnat Montdory 74
- Cox, E. G., Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel 625
- Craig, H, see Parrott, T M
- Crane, W G, Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance 147
- Crofts, J, Shakespeare and the Post Horses 395
- Cummings, E C, An Obscure Line in Brant's *Narranschaft* 283
- Daghlian, P B, see Hilles, F W
- Dallmann, W P, The Spirit of America as Interpreted in the Works of Charles Sealsfield 202
- Daum, H, Pierre Jurieu 229
- Deferrari, R J, Barry, M I, McGuire, M R P, A Concordance of Ovid 556
- Denapster, G, A Further Note on Dorigen's *Exempla* 137
- Denomy, A J (ed), The O F Lives of Saint Agnes 221
- D'Evelyn, C (ed), Peter Idley's *Instructions to his Son* 310
- De Vito, M S, L'origine del dramma liturgico 299
- Dorrer, A, Das Schemenlaufen in Tirol und verwandte alpenländische Masken- und Fasnachtsbrauche 234
- Draper, J W, Jaques' "Seven Ages" and Bartholomaeus Anglicus 273
- Dunlap, A R, What Purgative Drug? 92
- Edgcumbe, F. (ed), Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats 1820 1824 Preface by M B Forman 153
- Falqui, E., see Berton, G
- Fife, R H, see Zeydel, E H
- Firth, C, Essays Historical and Literary 156
- Fletcher, E G, The Beginnings of the Professional Theatre in Texas 202
- Fogle, S F, Notes on Ambrose Philips 354
- Forchheimer, P, Zu Morgensterns "Steinachs" 198.
- Forman, M B (ed), Some Letters and Miscellanea of Charles Brown 153, see also Edgcumbe, F.
- Françon, M (ed), Poèmes de transition (15^e-16^e siècle) 555
- Frank, G and Miner, D (eds), *Proverbes en rimes* 56
- Frey, J R, Bibliographie zur Theorie und Technik des deutschen Romans (1910-1938) 557
- Fucilla, J G, Unedited Voltaire Letters to Count di Polcenigo 184
- Gilbert, A H, Chapman's Fortune with Winged Hands Supplementary 201, Machiavelli's *Prince* and its Forerunners 469

- Galman, M, *Les Limbes* 195
 Glasser, E, Denkform und Gemeinschaft bei Jules Romains 223
 Goedheer, A J, Irish and Norse Traditions about the Battle of Clontarf 215
 Gold, M B, Swift's Marriage to Stella 59
 Gougenheim, G, *Eléments de Phonologie française* 218
 Greenlaw, E, Osgood, C G, Padel-ford, F M, Heffner, R, McManaway, J G, Mason, D E, Stirling, B (eds), *The Works of Edmund Spenser* 293
 Grierson, H J C, Sir Walter Scott, Bart 612
 Griffith, R H, *Phenagling* 291
 Grylls, R G, Mary Shelley 66
 Gutkind, C S, Cosimo de' Medici 475
- Hall, R A, Jr. 237
 Halstead, W L, Note on Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* 351, Note on the Text of *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt* 585
 Ham, E B, Fragments from the *Faits des Romains* 366
 Hammett, E A, A Note for the *NED* 449
 Hankamer, P, Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock 367
 Harbage, A, Cavalier Drama 209
 Harlan, E, Elijah Fenton 1683-1730 75
 Hartley, L C, William Cowper, Humanitarian 391
 Hartman, H (ed), *A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure* 316
 Hartman, J G, The Development of American Social Comedy from 1787 to 1936 632
 Hawkins, L F, The Place of Group F in the *Canterbury* Chronology 140
 Heffner, R, see Greenlaw, E
 Herben, S J, *The Ruin* 37
 Hill, R T (ed), Two O F Poems on Saint Thibaut 221
 Hilles, F W and Daghhian, P B (eds), Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting in England, 1760-1795* 231
 Holbrook, W C, A MS Copy of Writings by Voltaire 365.
 Holdsworth, F, Joseph de Maistre et l'Angleterre 230
- Holmes, E K, Some Sources of Wordsworth's Passages on Mythology 127
 Honti, J Th, Vinland and Ultima Thule 159
 Hubler, E, see Parrott, T M
 Hughes, M. Y. (ed), John Milton 75
- Ilmer, F, Some Remarks Regarding a Textual Change in Goethe's *Herdenroslem* 35
- John, L C, The Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences 315
 Johnson, M O, Walt Whitman as a Critic of Literature 202
 Johat, E, Smollett, Editor of Voltaire 429
 Jones, W P, Thomas Gray, Scholar 64
 Jourda, P, L'Exotisme dans la littérature française depuis Chateaubriand 378
- Kahn, L W, Social Ideals in German Literature 1770-1830 49, *Der Stachel der Liebe* 572
 Kastendieck, M M, England's Musical Poet, Thomas Campion 632
 Kennedy, R L, *La gala dei nadar*—Date and Authorship 514
 Kenyon, J S, *Wife of Bath's Tale* 1159-62 133
 Kessi, M, Corrections to the Shields Bibliography of Italian Translations 397
 Klenze, C von, Charles Timothy Brooks, Translator from the German, and the Genteel Tradition 42
 Klitzke, C, Hans Winter's *Bericht von der Kunst des Meistersgesangs* 567
 Knappen, M M, Tudor Puritanism 600
 Koenig, V F, *A Or Batu* A Problem in Lexicology 413
 Korner, J, Marginalien zu Heine II 399
 Konick, M, *Exeter Book Riddle* 41 as a Continuation of *Riddle* 40 259
 Kresz, B, Die Laute des modernen Isländischen 150
 Kunstmann, J G, *Hildebrandslied* 20-22a 501.

- Lagrone, G G, The Imitations of *Don Quixote* in the Spanish Drama 228
- Lancaster, H C, Castillo Solóizano's *El celoso hasta la muerte* and Montfleury's *Ecole des jaloux* 436, Saint-Réal's *Don Carlos* and *Phe-dre*, 1093 6 519
- Leander, F, Humanism and Naturalism 372
- Lemaître, G, Four French Novelists 389
- Lenz, H F H, Franz Grillparzer's Political Ideas and *Die Juden von Toledo* 622
- Levy, R, Repertoire des lexiques du vieux français 53
- Liedke, H R, Literary Criticism and Romantic Theory in the Work of Achim von Arnim 623
- Livingston, C H, O F *belluré* 506, O F *la (laa)*, Modern French *layette* 582, Tobler-Lommatzsch *Chief (Chaver)* 290
- Lotmatsch, see Tobler
- Lot, F, Joseph Bédier 1864-1938 554
- Lucas, F L (ed.), The Complete Works of John Webster 77
- McGinn, D J, Shakespeare's Influence on the Drama of his Age Studied in *Hamlet* 314
- McGuire, M. R P, see Deferrari, R J
- McKillop, A D, The Authorship of "A Poem to the Memory of Mr Congreve" 599
- McManaway, J G, see Greenlaw, E
- MacMillan, D (ed.), Drury Lane Calendar, 1747-1776 232
- Malkiel, J, Das substantivierte Adjektiv im Französischen 148, 238
- Malone, K, Some Linguistic Studies of 1937 and 1938 525
- Mann, W, Lateinische Dichtung in England 610
- Marcett, M E, Uhtred de Boldon 472
- Mare, M L and Quarrell, W H (trs.), Lichtenberg's Visits to England 308
- Marks, J, The Family of the Barrett 609
- Martin, B, see Mitzka, W.
- Martin, R, Chronologie de la vie et de l'œuvre de Thomas Gray 64, Essai sur Thomas Gray 64
- Mason, D. E., see Greenlaw, E
- Matenko, P, see Zeydel, E H
- Mathews, E G, Montfleury's *Ecole des jaloux* and Aphra Behn's *The False Count* 438
- Mautner, F H (ed.), Johann Nestrov 77
- Maxfield, M E, Studies in Modern Romansh Poetry in the Engadine 552
- Meier, J and Seemann, E (eds.), Lesebuch des deutschen Volksliedes 394
- Mersand, J, Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary 140
- Meyerson, H, Note on the Etymology of Names in Voltaine's *Zadig* 597
- Milani, D (tr.), F Olveiro, Francis Thompson 630
- Minde-Pouet, G (ed.), Heinrich von Kleists Werke 304
- Miner, D, see Frank, G
- Mitzka, W and Martin, B, Deutscher Sprachatlas 72
- Moore, J R, Defoe's Use of Personal Experience in *Colonel Jack* 362
- More, Paul Elmer, see Humanism
- Morgan, W T, A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715) 76
- Morphopoulos, P, Byron's Translation and Use of Modern Greek Writings 317
- Muchnic, H, Dostoevsky's English Reputation 624.
- Müller, W, Die Grundbegriffe der gesellschaftlichen Welt in den Werken des Abbé Prévost 627
- Murphree, A A and Strauch, C F, The Chronology of *The Return of the Native* 491.
- Mutschmann, H, An Answer to Dr Tillyard 398
- Naves, R, Voltaire et l'*Encyclopédie* 617
- Nethercot, A H, Sir William D'Avenant 606
- Nolte, F O, Grillparzer, Lessing, and Goethe in the Perspective of European Literature 543
- North, W R, Chinese Themes in American Verse 202.
- Noyes, G E, Bibliography of Courtesy and Conduct Books in 17th Century England 476
- O'Brien, J., Henry Harland, an American Forerunner of Proust 420, The Novel of Adolescence in France 389

- Olivero, F, Francis Thompson 630
 Osborn, L B, The Life, Letters, and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638 147
 Osgood, C G, see Greenlaw, E
- Padelford, F M, see Greenlaw, E
 Parrott, T M, Hubler, E, and Telfer, R S (eds), Shakespeare 313,
 — and Craig, H (eds), *The Tragedy of Hamlet* 205
 Percival, M O, William Blake's Circle of Destiny 68
 Pitou, S, Jr, A Portuguese Adaptation of La Calprenède's *Faramond* 192
 Pitt, A S, Franklin and William Penn's *No Cross, No Crown* 466
 Pope, W B, see Bodurtha, D H
 Piat, A, see Berton, G
 Prestel, J, Deutsche Literaturkunde 45
 Price, L M, Inkle and Yarico 470
 Privitera, J F, Molière in Franche-Comté 517
- Quarrell, W H, see Maie, M L
 Quynn, D M, The Identity of 'M T Coyfurelly' 510
- Reich, E, Grillparzer's dramatisches Werk 307
 Reichart, W A, see Voigt, F A
 Remak, H H, A Bibliographical Note on Voltaire 520, Heyse, Schott, and Fontane 287
 Rheinfelder, H, Altfranzösische Grammatik 218
 Richards, I A, The Philosophy of Rhetoric 213
 Riedel, F C, Crime and Punishment in the O F Romances 551
 Robe, S L, see Wright, L O
 Roberts, J G, Béranger's Neglected Poem to Manuel 32
 Roellinger, F X, A Note on *Kettner's Book of the Table* 363
 Rohlf, G 236
 Rollins, H E (ed), A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare The Poems 138
 Romera-Navarro, M (ed), Gracián, *El Criticón* 374
 Root, R K, The Poetical Career of Alexander Pope 541
- Salinas, P, see Subjects
 Salinger, H, Housman's *Last Poems*, XXX and Heine's *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, 62 288
- Sanderlin, G, Quotations from St Bernard in *The Parson's Tale* 447, The Repute of Shakespeare's Sonnets in the Early 18th Century 462
 Schirmer, W F, Geschichte der englischen Literatur 626
 Schweitzer, J W, Dryden's Use of Scudery's *Almahide* 190
 Scott-Thomas, H F, A Chaucerian (?) Fisherman 448
 Seeber, E D, Anti-Slavery Opinion in France during the Second Half of the 18th Century 55, Faiguet, réformateur de l'orthographe 523
 Seemann, E, see Maier, J
 Sehr, E H, The Comparative and Superlative Suffixes *er-est-* and *-or-est-* in Notker's Works 1; A Note on Line 1514 of the *Heland* 284
 Seillière, E, see Humanism
 Setzler, E B, E L, and H H, The Jefferson Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Reader 157
 Shaaber, M A, A Textual Dilemma in *1 Henry IV* 276
 Shaw, E P, New Facts Relating to the Biography of Jacques Cazotte 19
 Shields, N C, Corrections to the — Bibliography of Italian Translations 397
 Shine, H, Carlyle's Fusion of Poetry, History, and Religion by 1834 73
 Sorieri, L, Boccaccio's Story of Tito e Gisippo in European Literature 553
 Spanheimer, M E, Heinrich Armin Rattermann 76
 Sparnaay, H, Hartmann von Aue 631
 Spitzer, L, Robert A Hall, Jr, 237, It *bravo*, all *Poker*, fr *camée*, all *Schamotte* 633, Nochmals "Die Sonne geht zu Gnaden" 236, G Rohlf's 236, *Zebre* 78
 Starkie, E, Arthur Rimbaud in Abyssinia 74
 Stearns, M W, Robert Henryson and the Fulgentian Horse 239
 Stein, E P, David Garrick, Dramatist 210
 Steiner, A, An Italo-German *Faust-splitter* of 1621 286
 Stillman, D G, Milton as Proof Reader 353
 Stirling, B, see Greenlaw, E
 Stoll, E E, Jaques, and the Anti-quaries 79, Shakespeare Forbears

- 332, Shakespeare's Young Lovers 396
- Stiauch, C F see Murphree, A A
- Strout, A L, An Unpublished Ballad-Translation by Scott, *The Battle of Killecrankie* 13, cf 235
- Sturtevant, A M, The Doublets Old Icelandic *Skjti Skytja*, 'Shooter, Marksman' 445
- Sundermann, K H, Herman Melvilles Gedankengut 202
- Tannenbaum, S A, Beaumont and Fletcher (A Concise Bibliography) Philip Massinger (A Concise Bibliography) George Chapman (A Concise Bibliography) 605
- Taylor, A C, Carlyle et la pensée latine 154
- Telfer, R S, see Pariott, T M
- Thomas, J, L'Humanisme de Diderot 301
- Thomson, W (ed), The Sonnets of William Shakespeare and Henry Wriothesley 630
- Tillotson, G, On the Poetry of Pope 69
- Tillyard, E. M W, An Answer to — 398
- Tobler-Lommatszsch *Chief (Chaver)* 290.
- Tolkien, J R R, *Beowulf* The Monsters and the Critics 217
- Torrey, N L, The Spirit of Voltaire 383
- Tupper, F S, New Facts Regarding Owen Feltham 190
- Turgeon, F K, Unpublished Letters of Jean-Baptiste Racine to the Abbe Renaudot 172
- Turnbull, E L, see Salinas, P
- Turner, A M, The Making of *The Cloister and the Hearth* 312
- Van Dam, J, see Van Stockum, Th C
- Van Stockum, Th C and Van Dam, J., Geschichte der deutschen Literatur 45
- Varnum, F, Un Philosophe cosmopolite du 18^e siècle, le chevalier de Chastellux 550
- Vigneras, L-A, Notes sur Jean Renart 262
- Vincent, C J, Pettie and Greene 105
- Vincent, H P, Three Unpublished Letters of Abraham Cowley 454
- Vogelpohl, W, Von deutscher Dichtung 45.
- Voigt, F A and Reichart, W A, Hauptmann und Shakespeare 545
- Von der Mühl, E, Denis Veiras et son *Histoire des Scarambes* (1677-1679) 380
- Waide, I O, The Clandestine Organization and Diffusion of Philosophic Ideas in France from 1700 to 1750 385
- Wais, K, Mallarme 225
- Walz, J A, *Die Sonne geht zu Gnaden* 8, cf 236
- Waifel, H R, Poe's Dr Percival 129
- Wartburg, W von, Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker 547, Evolution et structure de la langue française 218
- Wasserman, E R, A Doubtful Poem in the Collins Canon 361, The Walpole Chatterton Controversy 460
- Wecter, D, Horace Walpole and Edmund Burke 124
- Weinberg, B, French Realism 389
- Wells, M E, The Age of Isaac at the Time of the Sacrifice 579
- White, G L, Jr, Scandinavian Themes in American Fiction 202
- White, N I, The Unextinguished Hearth, Shelley and his Contemporary Critics 71
- Whiting, B J, Proverbs in the Earlier English Drama 295
- Whitmore, M E, Medieval English Domestic Life and Amusements in the Works of Chaucer 140
- Williams, E B, From Latin to Portuguese 376
- Williams, H (ed), The Poems of Jonathan Swift 59
- Wilson, J D, What Happens in *Hamlet* 235
- Wilson, J H, Two Poems Ascribed to Rochester 458
- Withington, R, Excursions in English Drama 314
- Wolff, H M, *Der zerbrochene Krug* und *König Oedipus* 267
- Wright, A, The Beginning of Pope's Friendship with Spence 359
- Wright, L O, and Robe, S L, Final Consonant Plus N-Glide in Jalsico, Mexico, 439
- Zylander, O. R von, Heinrich von Kleist und J. J. Rousseau 306.

- Zeydel, E H, Matenko, P, and Fife, R H (eds), *Letters of Ludwig Tieck Hitherto Unpublished 1792-1853* 39
- Zink, H R, *Emerson's Use of the Bible* 202
- Zucker, A E, *The Courtiers in Hamlet and The Wild Duck* 196
- Zwirner, E and Zwirner, K, *Grundfragen der Phonometrie* 50

REVIEWS

- Allen, D C W Mann, *Latinsche Dichtung in England* 610
- Aubin, R A E Harlan, *Elijah Fenton 1683-1730* 75
- Baker, C H C F W Hilles and P B Daghljan (eds), *Horace Walpole, Anecdotes of Painting in England, 1760-1795* 231
- Baugh, A C I Baker, *The King's Household in the Arthurian Court from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Malory* 145
- Beach, J W E A Baker, *The History of the English Novel* 474
- Blankenagel, J C G Minde-Pouet (ed), *Heinrich von Kleists Werke* 304, O R von Xylander, *Heinrich von Kleist und J J Rousseau* 306
- Bowers, F T D J McGinn, *Shakespeare's Influence on the Drama of his Age Studied in Hamlet* 314
- Brandin, L D S Blondheim, *Les Gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi* 51.
- Bredvold, L I W T Morgan, *A Bibliography of British History (1700-1715)* 76
- Brooke, T H Baker, *Induction to Tragedy* 629, W Thomson (ed), *The Sonnets of William Shakespeare and Henry Wriothesley* 630
- Bryan, W F E B, E L, and H H Setzler, *The Jefferson Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Reader* 157.
- Castillo, C P Salinas, *Lost Angel and Other Poems* 303
- Chapman, C O M E Marcett, *Untred de Boldon* 472
- Chinard, G P Jourda, *L'Exotisme dans la littérature française depuis Chateaubriand* 378, L. M. Price, *Inkle and Yarico* 470; F Varnum, *Un Philosophe cosmopolite du 18^e siècle, le chevalier de Chastellux* 550.
- Clark, D L N I White, *The Unextinguished Hearth, Shelley and his Contemporary Critics* 71
- Cons, L G Frank and D Miner (eds), *Proverbes en rimes* 56
- Craig, H M M Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* 600
- Crooks, E J G G Lagrone, *The Imitations of Don Quixote in the Spanish Drama* 228
- Decker, C R H Muchnic, *Dostoevsky's English Reputation* 624
- De Vane, W C L Cazamian (tr), R Browning, *Hommes et Femmes* 394
- Dunn, W H H Shine, *Carlyle's Fusion of Poetry, History, and Religion by 1834* 73
- Eaton, H A H J C Grierson, *Sir Walter Scott, Bart.* 612
- Emarsson, S A J Goedheer, *Irish and Norse Traditions about the Battle of Clontarf* 215, B Kresz, *Die Laute des modernen Isländischen* 150, E Zwirner and K Zwirner, *Grundfragen der Phonometrie* 50.
- Ellis Fermor, U R R Cawley, *The Voyagers and Elizabethan Drama* 603
- Ewert, A R Levy, *Répertoire des lexiques du vieux français* 53
- Fagin, N B: J G Hartman, *The Development of American Social Comedy from 1787 to 1936* 632
- Feise, E E Castle (ed.), *Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte* 45, *Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1938* 234, L W Kahn, *Social Ideals in German Literature 1770-1830* 49, H R Liedke, *Literary Criticism and Romantic Theory in the Work of Achim von Arnim* 623, F H Mautner (ed), *Johann Nestroy* 77, J Prestel, *Deutsche Literaturkunde* 45, Th. C. van

- Stockum and J van Dam, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur 45, W Vogelpohl, Von deutscher Dichtung 45
- Finney, C L D H Bodurtha and W B Pope (eds), C A Brown, *Life of John Keats* 153, F Edgumbe (ed), Letters of Fanny Brawne to Fanny Keats 1820-1824 153, M B Forman (ed), Some Letters and Miscellanea of Charles Brown 153
- Gaede, W R. P Hankamer, Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock 367
- Gilbert, A H E Casady, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey 611
- Gohdes, C W P Dallmann, The Spirit of America as Interpreted in the Works of Charles Sealsfield 202, E G Fletcher, The Beginnings of the Professional Theatre in Texas 202, M O Johnson, Walt Whitman as a Critic of Literature 202, W R North, Chinese Themes in American Verse 202, K H Sundermann, Herman Melville's Gedankengut 202, G L White, Jr, Scandinavian Themes in American Fiction 202; H R Zink, Emerson's Use of the Bible 202
- Grierson, H J C E Greenlaw and others (eds), The Works of Edmund Spenser 293
- Hannay, N. C: L C Hartley, William Cowper, Humanitarian 391
- Havens, G R W Muller, Die Grundbegriffe der gesellschaftlichen Welt in den Werken des Abbé Prévost 627, R Naves, Voltaire et l'*Encyclopédie* 617
- Henderson, F A Harbage, Cavalier Drama 209
- Hooker, E N R Anthony, The Jeremy Collier Stage Controversy, 1698-1726 386
- Hudson, H H. W G Crane, Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance 147; L B Osborn, The Life, Letters, and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638 147
- Jones, F. L.: R. G. Grylls, Mary Shelley 66.
- Kaufmann, F W E Reich, Grillparzer's dramatisches Werk 307
- Kniecherbocker, K L J Marks, The Family of the Barrett 609
- Knudson, C A R C Bates (ed), *L'Histoire Job* 221, A J Denomy (ed), The O F Lives of Saint Agnes 221, G Gougenheim, *Éléments de phonologie française* 218, R T Hill (ed), Two O F Poems on Saint Thibaut 221, H Rheinfelder, *Altfranzösische Grammatik* 218, W von Wartburg, Evolution et structure de la langue française 218
- Lancaster, H C E Cother, Le Comédien auvergnat Montdory 74, R J DeFeillon, M I Barry, M R P McGuire, A Concordance of Ovid 556, *Helicon* 158
- Lane, F C C S Gutkind, Cosimo de' Medici 475
- Lang, V Essays and Studies 626
- Lasher Schmitt, D H F H Lenz, Franz Grillparzer's Political Ideas and *Die Juden von Toledo* 622, F O Nolte, Grillparzer, Lessing, and Goethe in the Perspective of European Literature 543
- Law, R A H E Rollins (ed), A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare The Poems 138
- Long, O W C von Klenze, Charles Timothy Brooks 42
- Lovejoy, A O F Leander, Humanism and Naturalism 372
- Lyons, C P I A Richards, The Philosophy of Rhetoric 213
- MacMillan, D. E P Stein, David Garrick, Dramatist 210
- Malakis, E I O Wade, The Clandestine Organization and Diffusion of Philosophic Ideas in France from 1700 to 1750 385
- Malone, K O S Anderson, *The Seafarer*, An Interpretation 232, W F Schurmer, Geschichte der englischen Literatur 626
- Mason, J F G Lemaitre, Four French Novelists 389, J O'Brien, The Novel of Adolescence in France 389, B Weinberg, French Realism 389
- Maxwell, B. S A Tannenbaum, Beaumont and Fletcher (A Concise Bibliography) 605

- Morley, S G M Romera-Navarro (ed.), Gracian, *El Criticon* 374
- Neill, K D Milan (tr.), F Olivero, Francis Thompson 630
- Neuse, W A Dorier, Das Schemen laufen in Tirol und verwandte alpenländische Masken und Faschachtsbrauche 234, J Meier and E Seemann (eds.), Lesebuch des deutschen Volkslieds 394
- Nordmeyer, G A Bach, Geschichte der deutschen Sprache 48
- Orsini, N A H Gilbert, Machiavelli's *Prince* and its Forerunners 469
- Painter, S F C Riedel, Crime and Punishment in the O F Romances 551
- Parker, W R M Y Hughes (ed.), John Milton 75
- Parks, G B M H Braaksma, Travel and Literature 625, E G Cox, Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel 625
- Patch, H R J R R Tolkien, *Beowulf* The Monsters and the Critics 217
- Potter, G R M M Kastendieck, England's Musical Poet, Thomas Campion 632
- Pyles, T T M Parrott and H Craig (eds.), *The Tragedy of Hamlet* 205
- Quintana, R M B Gold, Swift's Marriage to Stella 59, H Williams (ed.), The Poems of Jonathan Swift 59
- Raysor, T M L N Broughton (ed.), Sara Coleridge and Henry Reed 475
- Rice, W G S C Chew, The Crescent and the Rose 62
- Rollins, H E L B Campbell (ed.), *The Mirror for Magistrates* 207, L C John, The Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences 315
- Rotunda, D P L Sorieri, Boccaccio's Story of Tito e Gisippo in European Literature 553
- Ruud, M B L F Hawkins, The Place of Group F in the *Canterbury* Chronology 140, J Mersand, Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary 140, M E Whitmore, Medieval English Domestic Life and Amusements in the Works of Chaucer 140
- Ruutz Rees, C F Lot, Joseph Bedier 1864-1938 554
- Saurat, D M O Percival, William Blake's Circle of Destiny 68
- Savage, H L C D'Evelyn (ed.), Peter Idley's *Instructions to his Son* 310
- Scherer, J D A K Aish, La Métaphore dans l'œuvre de Stéphane Mallarmé 225, K Wais, Mallarmé 225
- Schinz, A E Carcassonne (ed.), Voltaire, *Le Temple du goût* 301, H Daum, Pierre Jurieu 229, F Holdsworth, Joseph Maistre et l'Angleterre 230, E Starkie, Arthur Rimbaud in Abyssinia 74, J Thomas, L'Humanisme de Diderot 301
- Sehrt, E H C T Carr, Nominal Compounds in Germanic 618, W Mitzka and B Martin, Deutscher Sprachatlas 72
- Selmer, C H Sparnaay, Hartmann von Aue 631
- Shepard, O E G Ainsworth, Poor Collins 64, W P Jones, Thomas Gray, Scholar 64, R Martin, Chronologie de la vie et de l'œuvre de Thomas Gray 64, R Martin, Essai sur Thomas Gray 64
- Sherburn, G R K Root, The Poetical Career of Alexander Pope 541, G Tillotson, On the Poetry of Pope 69
- Shine, H A C Taylor, Carlyle et la pensée latine 154
- Singleton, C S V Branca, Linee di una storia della critica al *Decameron* 615
- Smith, C S E Brennecke, Jr, John Milton the Elder and his Music 628
- Spencer, H R C. Bald (ed.), Middleton, *Hengist, King of Kent* 607, D MacMillan (ed.), Drury Lane Calendar, 1747 1776 232, A H Nethercot, Sir William D'Avenant 606, J D Wilson, What Happens in *Hamlet* 235
- Spencer, T E E Stoll, Shakespeare's Young Lovers 396
- Spitzer, L G Bertoni, Lingua e cultura (studi linguistici) 548, G Bertoni, E Falqui and A Prati,

- Dizionario di marina medievale e moderno 157, L P Brown, Some Romance Words of Arabic or Germanic Origin 627, E Glasser, Denkform und Gemeinschaft bei Jules Romans 223, J Malkiel, Das substantivierte Adjektiv im Französischen 148, 238, W von Waitburg, Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker 547, E B Williams, From Latin to Portuguese 376
- Steinhauer, H H Barnstorff, Die soziale, politische und wirtschaftliche Zeitkritik im Werke Gerhart Hauptmanns 545
- Stone, G W, Jr M L Mare and W H Quarrell (trs), Lichtenberg's Visits to England 308
- Stout, G D L A Brewer, My Leigh Hunt Library 393
- Taylor, G C B Coles, Shakespeare Studies *Hamlet* 233, J Crofts, Shakespeare and the Post Horses 395; T M Parrott, E Hubler, and R S Telfer (eds), Shakespeare 313, R Withington, Excursions in English Drama 314
- Teeter, L F L Lucas (ed), The Complete Works of John Webster 77.
- Tilley, M P B J Whiting, Proverbs in the Earlier English Drama 295
- Tindall, W Y A M Turner, The Making of *The Cloister and the Hearth* 312.
- Ustick, W L G E Noyes, Bibliography of Courtesy and Conduct Books in 17th Century England 476
- Vaughan, H H M E Maxfield, Studies in Modern Romansh Poetry in the Engadine 532
- Vincent, C J H Hartman (ed), *A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure* 316
- Wade, I E D Seeber, Anti-Slavery Opinion in France during the Second Half of the 18th Century 55, N L Torrey, The Spirit of Voltaire 383, E Von der Muhll, Denis Veiras et son *Histoire des Sévarambes* (1677-1679) 380
- Weigand, H J E H Zeydel, P Matenko, and R H Fife (eds), Letters of Ludwig Tieck 39
- Whicher, G F R P T Coffin, New Poetry of New England, Frost and Robinson 614
- Wiley, W L M Françon (ed), Poèmes de transition (15^e-16^e siècle) 555
- Willey, B C Firth, Essays Historical and Literary 156.
- Young, K M S De Vito, L'origine del dramma liturgico 299
- Zeeveld, W G. R W Chambers, Thomas More 142
- Zucker, A E M E. Spanheimer, Heinrich Armin Rattermann 76

